

ARCHAIC ROMAN RELIGION

WITH AN APPENDIX ON
THE RELIGION OF THE ETRUSCANS

GEORGES DUMÉZIL

TRANSLATED BY PHILIP KRAPP

FOREWORD BY MIRCEA ELIADE

VOLUME ONE

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY PRESS
BALTIMORE AND LONDON

Originally published in 1966 as
La Religion romaine archaïque suivi d'un appendice sur la religion des Etrusques
© 1966, Editions Payot, Paris

The English translation has been revised and annotated by the author

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper
Originally published in the United States in 1970 as a two-volume set by the
University of Chicago Press

Licensed by the University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois
© 1970 by The University of Chicago. All rights reserved

Johns Hopkins edition, 1996
05 04 03 02 01 00 99 98 97 96 5 4 3 2 1

The Johns Hopkins University Press
2715 North Charles Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218-4319
The Johns Hopkins Press Ltd., London

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Dumézil, Georges, 1898–

[Religion romaine archaïque. English]

Archaic Roman religion : with an appendix on the religion of the Etruscans / Georges
Dumézil : translated by Philip Krapp : foreword by Mircea Eliade.

p. cm.

Originally published : Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1970.
Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-8018-5482-2 (v. 1. : alk. paper).—ISBN 0-8018-5480-6 (v. 1. : pbk. : alk. paper).—

ISBN 0-8018-5483-0 (v. 2. : alk. paper).—ISBN 0-8018-5481-4 (v. 2. : pbk. : alk. paper).

1. Rome—Religion. 2. Etruscans—Religion. I. Title.

BL802.D813 1996

292.07—dc20

96-14884

A catalog record for this book is available from the British Library.

CONTENTS

VOLUME ONE

FOREWORD, BY MIRCEA ELIADE	xi
PREFACE	xv
ABBREVIATIONS	xxiii

Preliminary Remarks

1	Uncertainty of the History of the First Centuries	3
2	Political History and Religious History	13
3	The Most Ancient Roman Religion: <i>Numen</i> or <i>Deus</i> ?	18
4	Characteristics of the Roman Gods	32
5	The Lost Mythology: The Example of the <i>Matralia</i>	47
6	From Mythology to History	60
7	The Indo-European Heritage at Rome	79
8	Conservatism of Roman Religion: The Case of the <i>Iuges auspicium</i>	83
9	The Value of Formulary Evidence	89
10	The Roman Scholars	97
11	The So-Called Pontifical Revolution	102
12	Some Characteristics of Roman Religion	113
13	Balances in Roman Religion	118
14	The Vocabulary of the Sacred	129
15	The Purpose of This Book	134

FIRST PART

The Great Gods of the Archaic Triad

1	The Archaic Triad: The Documents	141
2	Interpretation: The Three Functions	148
3	Jupiter	176
4	Mars	205
5	Quirinus	246
6	The Archaic Triad: Complements	273

SECOND PART

Ancient Theology

1	The Capitoline Triad	283
	Capitoline Jupiter	283
	Juno	291
	Minerva	303
	The Capitoline Triad	306
2	The Fires of Public Worship	311
3	Frameworks	327
	The Beginnings	327
	The Times	333
	The Places	340
4	Man	356
	The Living	356
	The Dead	363
5	Forces and Elements	370
	Third Function	370
	Second and First Functions	390

VOLUME TWO

THIRD PART

Extensions and Mutations

1	Personified Abstractions	397
2	The Gods of the Neighbors	407

CONTENTS

ix

3	The Gods of the Enemy	424
4	The Gods of the Merchants	432
5	The First Greek Gods	441
6	An Attempt at Chronology	446
7	Religion during the Second Punic War	457
8	The First Literary Evidence	490
9	Ideological Innovations	497
10	Thrusts and Resistances	512
11	The Civil Wars and Religion	526

FOURTH PART The Cult

1	<i>Sacra publica</i>	553
2	<i>Sacerdotes</i>	576
3	<i>Signa</i> and <i>Portenta</i>	594
4	Notes on the Private Cults	611

APPENDIX. The Religion of the Etruscans	625
Introduction	625
The "Libri" of the Etruscans	633
<i>Libri fulgurales</i>	637
<i>Libri haruspicini</i>	649
<i>Libri rituales</i>	660
The Gods	673
Groupings of Gods	684
The World of the Dead	691
Selected Works on Etruscan Religion	695

INDEX	697
-------	-----

FOREWORD

Georges Dumézil is perhaps the only foreign author to have his first book translated into English three years after the publication of a whole volume devoted to the critical discussion of his theories. Indeed, when C. Scott Littleton published *The New Comparative Mythology: An Anthropological Assessment of the Theories of Georges Dumézil* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1966), not a single one of Dumézil's articles had been translated into English—this for a man who was at that time the author of some thirty volumes and almost two hundred studies and review articles.

And it so happened that the first book to appear in English, though one of the most recent and most important, does not belong to the series dedicated to the comparative study of Indo-European religions and mythologies, the series that put Georges Dumézil at the center of a long and passionate methodological debate. From 1940 on, he was, in fact, becoming well known, first and foremost, as the champion of a new, structural interpretation of Indo-European religious institutions and mythologies which he saw as reflecting a tripartite ideology—the interpretation being elaborated specifically in a book published in 1958 with just this title (*L'idéologie tripartite des Indo-Européens*). While enthusiastically followed by some of the most distinguished scholars from every area of Indo-European studies, Dumézil's comparative method was also criticized (and not always in the most relaxed manner) by other specialists.

The resistance to Dumézil's approach, fortunately now being overcome in many countries, originated probably for three main reasons: (1) the fact that the discipline of comparative Indo-European mythology had been hopelessly discredited by the improvisations of

Max Müller and his followers; (2) the tendency, general in the first quarter of the century, to interpret the spiritual and cultural life of the protohistorical peoples in the light of what was considered characteristic of the "primitives"; thus, the well-articulated mythology, and especially the implied ideological system, attributed by Dumézil to the early Indo-Europeans seemed too coherent and too "profound" for a protohistorical society; (3) the conviction of the specialists in the particular Indo-European philologies that it is impossible for a single scholar to master the entire area of Indo-European studies.

All these reasons were based on as many misunderstandings: (1) Dumézil did not use Max Müller's philological (i.e., etymological) method, but a historical one; he compared historically related socio-religious phenomena (i.e., the institutions, mythologies, and theologies of a number of peoples descended from the same ethnic, linguistic, and cultural matrix), and eventually he proved that the similarities point to an original *system* and not to a casual survival of heterogeneous elements. (2) Modern research has exploded the evolutionist fallacy of the inability of the "primitive" to think rationally and "systematically"; furthermore, the proto-Indo-European culture, far from being "primitive," was already enriched through continuous, though indirect, influences from the higher, urban civilizations of the ancient Near East. (3) The "impossibility" of mastering so many philologies is a false postulate grounded on personal experience or statistical information, but ultimately irrelevant; the only convincing argument would have been to prove that Dumézil's interpretation of, let us say, a Sanskrit, Celtic, or Caucasian text betrays his inadequate knowledge of the respective language.

In an impressive series of books and monographs which appeared between 1940 and 1960, Georges Dumézil has investigated the Indo-European tripartite conception of society, namely, its division into three superposed zones corresponding to three functions: sovereignty, warrior force, economic prosperity. Each function constitutes the responsibility of a socio-political category (kings or priests, warriors, food producers), and is directly related to a specific type of divinity (in ancient Rome, for example, Jupiter, Mars, Quirinus). The first function is divided into two complementary parts or aspects, the magical and juridical sovereignty, illustrated in Vedic India by Varuṇa and Mitra. This basic ideological configuration of the proto-Indo-Europeans has

been differently developed and reinterpreted by the various Indo-European peoples in the course of their separate histories. For example, Dumézil has convincingly shown that the Indian mind elaborated the original scheme in cosmological terms while the Romans "historicized" the mythological data, so that the most archaic, and the only genuine, Roman mythology is to be deciphered in the "historical" personages and events described by Livy in the first book of his *Histories*.

Dumézil has completed his thorough study of the tripartite ideology in a number of monographs on Indo-European rituals and on Vedic and Latin goddesses, and, quite recently (1966), he brought out the present book on Roman religion, the first of his works to appear in English. The stupendous erudition and the untiring productivity of Georges Dumézil constitute one of the most fascinating enigmas of contemporary scholarship. And perhaps the most depressing aspect of some of the debates centering on his writings has been precisely the tendency on the part of certain critics to ignore his *œuvre* during their discussions of specific details. For the important, the decisive, element in the evaluation of Dumézil's contributions is his general system of interpretation, and one has always to keep in mind the ensemble of his writings on Indo-European religions and mythologies when criticizing any of the specific applications of his method.

La religion romaine archaïque represents a new phase in Dumézil's production. It is true that he had earlier devoted some books to various problems in Roman religion, but he always approached the subject from an Indo-European comparative perspective. (See, for instance, the four volumes of *Jupiter, Mars, Quirinus*, 1941-48; *Rituels indo-européens à Rome*, 1954; *Déeses latines et mythes védiques*, 1956; etc.). Now, for the first time, archaic Roman religion is presented in its totality—though, of course, references to other Indo-European religions are not wholly lacking. This vast, superb work is not a textbook, nor is it a collection of monographs loosely integrated. The author insists on the central place to be given what he rightly considers the most important element in the understanding of any type of religion, that is, its ideas and representations of divinity: in sum, its theology. It is refreshing and inspiring to read Dumézil's criticism of the so-called *mana*-theory, enthusiastically utilized by H. J. Rose and other scholars to explain the "origins" and structure of

Roman religion. One looks forward to the volume in which Dumézil will discuss the different contemporary approaches to the study of Roman religion. But even in the present work the strictures against Rose, H. Wagenvoort, and Kurt Latte constitute, in themselves, invaluable methodological contributions.

Fortunately, more and more the specialists are accepting and conveniently utilizing Dumézil's method and results. In addition to the importance of his work—and, for the moment, it is the only new and significant contribution to the understanding of Indo-European religions—the *example* of Dumézil is no less important to the discipline of the history of religions. He has shown how to complement a meticulous philological and historical analysis of the texts with insights gained from sociology and philosophy. He has also shown that only by deciphering the basic ideological system underlying the social and religious institutions can a particular divine figure, myth, or ritual be correctly understood.

MIRCEA ELIADE

The University of Chicago, August 1969

PREFACE

To the colleagues and scholars who follow my work I must say briefly why, as a mythographer and a comparatist, I am here taking on a task which is traditionally reserved for Latinists or for archaeologists, along with the risks which this usurpation involves.

At the moment when the proposal was made to me, seven years ago, to write the Roman volume for a collection on the religions of humanity, it proved to correspond to a double need, I might say a double necessity, of my own research.

Ten years had passed since the publication of my little book *L'héritage indo-européen à Rome*, the ambitious title of which was certainly premature. During those ten years, I had not ceased to call in question the results which had been set forth and to approach, in extended order, a quantity of new comparative problems. The balance sheet of "the heritage" underwent a transformation. On the one hand, it was considerably enlarged: the four 1949 chapters had given to many the impression that, outside of what is covered by the combined names of Jupiter, Mars, and Quirinus, the Indo-European comparison contributes very little to the exegesis of religious life at Rome. I believed so myself: between 1938 and 1949, attending to the most urgent concerns, I had concentrated my investigation on this central area. But, in the following years, consideration of very diverse rituals, of several apparently isolated figures in the theology, and of important religious ideas having no particular connection with the tripartition showed, on the contrary, the breadth of the material lying within the scope of the comparison. On the other hand, under this new illumination, points which had until then seemed to me to be essential in the very area of the tripartition and on which I had

extended and reopened discussions lost their usefulness in my eyes: for example, the question of the meaning, functional or not, of the three primitive tribes of Rome. As my work proceeded, I gained a clearer awareness of the possibilities, but also of the limits, of the comparative method, in particular of what should be its Golden Rule, namely, that it permits one to explore and clarify structures of thought but not to reconstruct events, to "fabricate history," or even pre-history, a temptation to which the comparatist is no less exposed, and with the same gloomy prognosis, than the philologist, the archaeologist, and of course the historian. The proposal which had been offered to me encouraged me to press forward systematically both with my research and my revision. Several years of seminars at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes (Religious Sciences) and of courses at the Collège de France were devoted to this work. Two series of reports submitted to my young comrades on the rue d'Ulm, and the discussions of these reports which several of them conducted, were particularly profitable to me: on "Jupiter-Mars-Quirinus," on the agrarian Mars, on "flāmen-brahman," and on a great many subjects which have occupied me for almost thirty years, there will be found here, substituted for the first and second drafts, the clearer, more rigorous, sometimes entirely new version resulting from this examination.

Since *L'héritage*, another necessity had become apparent to me, cutting across the resistance or the reserve which that book had provoked in a number of favorably disposed Latinists. It is not enough to extract from early Roman religion the pieces which can be explained by the religions of other Indo-European peoples. It is not enough to recognize and to present the ideological and theological structures which are shown by the interrelations of these blocks of prehistoric tradition. One must put them back in place, or rather leave them *in situ*, in the total picture and observe how they behaved in the different periods of Roman religion, how they survived, or perished, or became changed. In other words, one must establish and reestablish the continuity between the Indo-European "heritage" and the Roman reality. At a very early stage I had understood that the only means of obtaining this solidarity, if it can be obtained, was to change one's viewpoint, to join those whom one had to convince. Without surrendering the advantages of the comparative method, or the results of Indo-European research, but by adding to this new apparatus, in no

order of preference, the other traditional ways of knowing, one must consider Rome and its religion in themselves, for themselves, as a whole. Stated differently, the time had come to write a general history of the religion of the Roman Republic, after so many others, from the Roman point of view. The editor's proposal gave substance to this project, the breadth of which frightened me. In the synthesis presented in this book, "the Indo-European heritage" is only one of many elements, in harmony with the others. Moreover, the service performed by this cohabitation of the new and the old is not one-directional: if a few excesses of the first comparative inquiries are curtailed by it, only the recognition of the Indo-European heritage, carefully delimited, in turn limits the freedom which for half a century, in France and abroad, has been readily given to archaic Roman "history," especially religious history. The survey presented here is determinedly conservative, justifying a host of ancient facts to which uncontrolled criticism and the fantasy of the schools and of individuals had granted themselves all the rights. We are at one of those reassuring moments which all human sciences experience more than once in the course of their development, when new points of view and new tools of observation rediscover the freshness of the old landscapes, at the expense of the mirages which had been substituted for them. Along with these mirages, one part of the difficulty which seemed to separate "Indo-European Rome" from historical Rome also disappears.

One point is still sensitive and painful, and will remain so for a long time. The welding of my work with "reality" will be more or less easy according to one's ideas, based on archaeology, of the protohistoric and prehistoric periods of Rome. To tell the truth, in this regard too, the sometimes spirited debates which I have carried on for fifteen or twenty years no longer seem so important to me. In every way, whatever Roman protohistory may have been, and even if one chooses to include the Sabines in it, the actual events have been covered, or rather reconstructed, by traditional ideology and by the legends which it has produced in the annalistic tradition. Above all, the real disagreement among the greatest names in Roman archaeology over the question of origins proves clearly that the speculations which certain followers of this discipline boldly call "facts" must still undergo many tests before they merit this great

name. My personal preferences tend toward the sober and rigorous method of A. von Gerkan and H. Müller-Karpe. The latter's two short volumes, *Vom Anfang Roms* (1959) and *Zur Stadtwerdung Roms* (1962), the fifth and eighth *Ergänzungshefte* of the *Römische Mitteilungen*, seem to me well able to exorcise many demons. Since I have mentioned welding, it seems to me that the first part of the present book could be added without difficulty, as a fifth chapter, to Müller-Karpe's 1959 book, provided the author would admit that the material traces cataloged in his chapter 4—"Menschenfiguren, Beigefässe, Hausurnen"—do not yield to us the whole, or the essentials, of the earliest religion. On the problem of the original Sabine component and the earliest peopling of the Quirinal, in particular, I feel that I am in full accord with what is said on pages 38-39 (cf. pp. 44-46 of the 1962 book):

The old conception of von Duhn, according to which we have, with the tombs of the Quirinal and the Esquiline, direct evidence of the Sabines, while the greater number of those in the Forum are evidence of the Latins, is no longer tenable today. It has been very generally recognized that it is extraordinarily difficult, and even altogether impossible, to establish equivalences between cultures revealed by archaeology and groups of languages or ethnic units (*Röm.-Germ. Forschungen* 22, 44). Above all, one should get rid of the idea that the funeral rites, in the first Italic Iron Age and especially at Rome, may be considered ethnic criteria. The differences in forms and practices among the three groups of burials which can be observed at Rome are obviously to be interpreted in terms of chronology, not of races.

The future of these studies would be assured if specialists in the various disciplines which contribute to the knowledge of early Rome were willing to take into account the file of problems and solutions which the comparatist here sets before them, in order to specify or improve it. Unfortunately we are far from this happy collaboration. One is baffled to see a Kurt Latte write a handbook of Roman religion, or a Carl Koch edit the article "Quirinus" in the *Real-Encyclopädie*, without deigning to mention the existence of the Umbrian Jupiter-Mars-Vofionus triad, which prevents explaining the Roman Jupiter-Mars-Quirinus triad through reasons peculiar to Rome (see below, pp. 149-50).

Be that as it may, this book, with its sequel, mentioned on pages 137-38, will be my last summing-up in the field of Roman religion:

in fifteen or twenty years, it will no longer be I who makes the evaluation; I confidently turn over this job to my juniors. Here is how I envisage the management of this final period of activity. If the labors of Werner Betz exempt me from making a reevaluation similar to the present work for the Germanic world, I should like to attempt, in the Vedic domain, to make the necessary insertion of the comparative results in the body of the data: I shall probably not have time for this. More urgent are two books on the epic, the first of which is to be published by Editions Gallimard, under the title *Mythe et Épopée*, vol. 1, *L'idéologie des trois fonctions dans les épopées des peuples indo-européens*. A volume on Jupiter-Mars-Quirinus, not definitive but brought up to date, will follow, and also a book on the theology of sovereignty (to be published by the University of Chicago Press), in which my early essays on Mitra-Varuṇa, Aryaman, and the "minor sovereigns" will be revised and partially changed. Finally, in the spirit of liberty and equity defined at the end of "Preliminary Remarks," I hope to offer for the use of young people a historical account of these studies, the progress of which has been neither straight nor easy; also to examine the work of my adversaries, with the aim of clarifying, and in part of justifying, their opposition, which has sometimes assumed unusual forms; and more generally to convey my testimony concerning the masters of my youth and also concerning the scholarly world which I have witnessed or experienced.

Comprehensive surveys of the religion of the royal and republican periods are very numerous, and several of them (A. Grenier, H. J. Rose, and others) will be mentioned in the body of the present book. Besides Georg Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, 2d ed., 1912, and Kurt Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte*, 1960, the reader should consult especially the following works, which expound very diverse points of view:

Altheim, Franz. *Römische Religionsgeschichte*. 2d ed. 1956. Vol. 1, *Grundlagen und Grundbegriffe*. Vol. 2, *Der geschichtliche Ablauf*.

Bailey, Cyril. *Phases in the Religion of Ancient Rome*. 1932.

———. "Roman Religion and the Advent of Philosophy." In *The Cambridge Ancient History* 8 (1930): 423–65.

Bayet, Jean. *Histoire politique et psychologique de la religion romaine*. 1957. 2d ed. 1969.

David, Maurice. *La religion romaine*. 1948.

Fowler, W. Warde. *The Religious Experience of the Roman People*. 1911.

———. *The Roman Festivals of the Period of the Republic*. 1899.

Grant, Frederick C. *Ancient Roman Religion*. 1957.

Radke, Gerhard. *Die Götter Altitaliens*. 1965.

Turchi, Nicola. *La religione di Roma antica*. 1939.

This book was originally intended for a German collection, and the manuscript—which I continually updated—was sent to the publisher in 1963. As delays in translation stretched out with no foreseeable end, I reacquired my rights to the book, and I thank M. Pidoux-Payot for the diligence with which he immediately undertook its publication in France. I wish also to express my gratitude to Editions Gallimard and to the Presses Universitaires de France, who have authorized me to reproduce in the "Preliminary Remarks" several passages from earlier books, thus sparing me the hazardous effort of expressing, in a different way, ideas which have not changed. A young Japanese scholar, Mr. Atsuhiko Yoshida, has been kind enough to help me in the preparation of the index, and in this connection has given me valuable advice, from which I have still been able to profit.

GEORGES DUMÉZIL

Istanbul, September 1966

I am very pleased that the University of Chicago Press decided to make this work available to the English-speaking public, and for his encouragement in this respect I wish to thank my friend and colleague Mircea Eliade. In this translation some passages have been modified and some discussion added in the notes.

I am happy to have found in Mr. Philip Krapp a competent and dedicated translator.

Most of the English translations of passages from Latin and Greek authors are, with a few minor variations, taken from the Loeb Classical Library translations and are reprinted by permission of the publishers, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and the Loeb Classical Library from: Augustine, *City of God*, trans. W. M. Green; Cicero, *De divinatione* and *De senectute*, trans. W. A. Falconer, *De natura deorum*, trans. H. Rackham, *De Republica*, trans. C. W. Keyes; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Roman Antiquities*, trans.

E. Cary; Herodotus, *History of the Persian Wars*, trans. A. D. Godley; Horace, *Odes and Epodes*, trans. C. E. Bennett; Livy, *Roman History*, trans. B. O. Foster, F. G. Moore, and E. T. Sage; Ovid, *Fasti*, trans. J. G. Frazer, *Metamorphoses*, trans. F. J. Miller; Pausanias, *Description of Greece*, trans. W. H. S. Jones; Plutarch, *Parallel Lives*, trans. Bernadotte Perrin; Silius Italicus, *Punica*, trans. J. D. Duff; Suetonius, *Lives of the Caesars*, trans. J. C. Rolfe; Varro, *On the Latin Language*, trans. R. G. Kent; Virgil, *Aeneid*, trans. H. R. Fairclough; Vitruvius, *On Architecture*, trans. Frank Granger.

Volume I of my *Mythe et Épopée*, mentioned above, was published in 1968.

G.D.

University of Chicago, February 1970

ABBREVIATIONS

GREEK AND LATIN AUTHORS

Aelian.	Κλαύδιος Αἰλιανός (Aelianus)
Anim.	Περὶ ζώων (<i>De natura animalium</i>)
V.H.	Ποικίλη ἱστορία (<i>Varia historia</i>)
App.	Ἀππιανός (Appian)
B.C.	Ῥωμαϊκὰ ἐμφύλια, A-E (<i>Bella ciuilia</i>)
Pun.	Καρχηδονικά (<i>Bella Punica</i>)
Apul. Mag.	L. Apuleius, <i>De magia</i>
Arn. Gent.	Arnobius, <i>Disputationes aduersus gentes</i>
Aug. Ciu. D.	Aurelius Augustinus (St. Augustine), <i>De ciuitate Dei</i>
Aur. Vict. Or.	[Aurelius Victor], <i>Origo gentis Romanae</i>
Caes. B.G.	C. Julius Caesar, <i>De bello Gallico</i>
Cass. Dio	Δίων ὁ Κασσιος (Dio Cassius), Ῥωμαϊκὴ ἱστορία
Cat.	C. Valerius Catullus, <i>Carmina</i>
Cato Agr.	M. Porcius Cato (Cato the Censor), <i>De agricultura</i>
Cels.	A. Cornelius Celsus, <i>De medicina</i>
Censor.	Censorinus, <i>De die natali</i>
Cic.	M. Tullius Cicero
Amic.	<i>De amicitia</i>
Arch.	<i>Pro Archia poeta</i>
Cael.	<i>Pro Caelio</i>
Diu.	<i>De diuinatione</i>
Ep. ad Brut.	<i>Epistolae ad Brutum</i>
Fin.	<i>De finibus</i>
Font.	<i>Pro Fonteio</i>
Har. resp.	<i>De haruspicum responso</i>

<i>Leg.</i>	<i>De legibus</i>
<i>Leg. agr.</i>	<i>De lege agraria</i>
<i>Mil.</i>	<i>Pro Milone</i>
<i>Mur.</i>	<i>Pro Murena</i>
<i>Nat. d.</i>	<i>De natura deorum</i>
<i>Philip.</i>	<i>Philippicae</i>
<i>Scaur.</i>	<i>Pro Aem. Scauro</i>
<i>Sen.</i>	<i>De senectute</i>
<i>Sest.</i>	<i>Pro P. Sestio</i>
<i>Vat.</i>	<i>In Vatinius</i>
Claud. B. Get.	Claudius Claudianus (Claudian), <i>De bello Getico</i>
Columella	Lucius Junius Moderatus Columella, <i>De re rustica</i>
Conon Narr.	<i>Κόνων</i> (Conon Mythographus), <i>Διηγήσεις</i> (Narrationes)
Diod. Sic.	<i>Διόδωρος ὁ Σικελιώτης</i> (Diodorus Siculus), <i>Ἱστοριῶν βιβλιοθήκη</i>
Dion.	<i>Διονύσιος Ἀλικαρνασσεύς</i> (Dionysius of Halicarnassus), <i>Ῥωμαϊκὴ ἀρχαιολογία</i>
Fest. L ² (Paul. L ²)	S. Pompeius Festus, <i>De uerborum significatu</i> (Pauli Diaconi <i>epitoma</i>), 2d ed. of W. M. Lindsay = <i>Glossaria Latina</i> 4 (1930): 91-457
Flor.	L. Annaeus Florus, <i>Rerum Romanarum epitome</i>
Gell.	Aulus Gellius, <i>Noctes Atticae</i>
Gloss. (Lat.)	<i>Glossaria (Latina)</i> , iussu Academiae Britannicae edita
Herod.	<i>Ἡρόδοτος</i> (Herodotus), <i>Ἱστορίας ἀποδέξις</i>
Herodian.	<i>Ἡρωδιανός</i> (Herodian), <i>Τῆς μετὰ Μάρκον βασιλείας ἱστορίαι</i>
Hor.	Q. Horatius Flaccus (Horace)
ad Pis.	<i>ad Pisones</i>
Carm.	<i>Carmina</i> (Odes)
Ep.	<i>Epistolae</i>
Epod.	<i>Epodi</i>
Serm.	<i>Sermones</i> (Satires)
ps.-Acro in Hor., Porphyr. in Hor.	pseudo-Acro, Porphyrio, <i>Scholiae in Horatium</i>
Hyg.	C. Julius Hyginus, <i>Fabulae</i>
Isid. Etym.	Isidorus Hispalensis (Isidore of Seville), <i>Etymologiae (siue Origines)</i>

Jul. Obs.	Julius Obsequens, <i>Prodigiorum liber</i>
Justin.	M. Justinus (Justin), <i>Pompei Trogi historiarum Philippicarum epitoma</i>
Juv.	D. Junius Juvenalis (Juvenal), <i>Saturae</i>
Liv.	Titus Livius (Livy), <i>Ab urbe condita libri qui supersunt</i>
Liv. per.	<i>Omnium librorum periochae</i>
Luc. Phars.	M. Annaeus Lucanus (Lucan), <i>Belli ciuilis libri (Pharsalia)</i>
Lucr.	T. Lucretius Carus, <i>De rerum natura</i>
Lyd.	Ἰωάννης Λαυρέντιος ὁ Λυδός (Lydus)
Mens.	Περὶ μηνῶν (<i>De Mensibus</i>)
Ost.	Περὶ διοσημειῶν (<i>De Ostentis</i>)
Macr.	Aurelius Macrobius, <i>Saturnalia</i>
Mart. Cap.	Martianus Felix Capella, <i>De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii</i>
Non. L.	Nonius Marcellus, <i>De compendiosa doctrina</i> , ed. Lindsay (Teubner, 1903)
Ov.	P. Ovidius Naso (Ovid)
Am.	<i>Amores</i>
F.	<i>Fasti</i>
Met.	<i>Metamorphoseis</i>
Pont.	<i>Epistolae ex Ponto</i>
Tr.	<i>Tristia</i>
Paul. L ²	See Fest. L ²
Paus.	Παυσανίας (Pausanias), Ἑλλάδος περιήγησις
Pers.	A. Persius Flaccus, <i>Saturae</i>
Petr.	T. Petronius Arbiter, <i>Satyricon</i>
Plaut.	T. Maccius Plautus
Amph.	<i>Amphitruo</i>
Asin.	<i>Asinaria</i>
Aul.	<i>Aulularia</i>
Capt.	<i>Captiui</i>
Cas.	<i>Casina</i>
Curc.	<i>Curculio</i>
Men.	<i>Menaechmi</i>
Merc.	<i>Mercator</i>
Mil.	<i>Miles gloriosus</i>
Pers.	<i>Persa</i>
Pseud.	<i>Pseudolus</i>

<i>Rud.</i>	<i>Rudens</i>
<i>Stich.</i>	<i>Stichus</i>
<i>Trin.</i>	<i>Trinummus</i>
<i>Truc.</i>	<i>Truculentus</i>
Plin. N.H.	C. Plinius Secundus (Pliny the Elder), <i>Naturalis Historia</i>
Plut.	Πλούταρχος (Plutarch)
<i>Mor.</i>	Ἠθικά (<i>Moralia</i>):
<i>De frat. am.</i>	Περὶ φιλαδελφίας (<i>De fraterno amore</i>)
<i>Q.R.</i>	Ῥωμαϊκά (<i>Quaestiones Romanae</i>)
[<i>Vit.</i>]	βίοι παράλληλοι (<i>Vitae parallelae</i>):
<i>Aem. Paul.</i>	<i>Aemilius Paulus</i>
<i>Caes.</i>	<i>Caesar</i>
<i>Cam.</i>	<i>Camillus</i>
<i>C. Gr.</i>	<i>C. Gracchus</i>
<i>Cor.</i>	<i>Coriolanus</i>
<i>Crass.</i>	<i>Crassus</i>
<i>Mar.</i>	<i>Marius</i>
<i>Marc.</i>	<i>Marcellus</i>
<i>Num.</i>	<i>Numa</i>
<i>Public.</i>	<i>Publicola</i>
<i>Rom.</i>	<i>Romulus</i>
<i>Syll.</i>	<i>Sulla</i>
Pol.	Πολύβιος (Polybius), Ἱστορίαι
Procop. B. Got.	Προκόπιος (Procopius), Ὑπὲρ τῶν πολέμων E-H (<i>De bello Gothico</i>)
Sen. N.Q.	L. Annaeus Seneca, <i>Naturales quaestiones</i>
Serv. (Serv. II)	Servius (Servius Danielis, interpolator), <i>Commentarii in Vergilium</i>
Sil. It.	C. Silius Italicus, <i>Punica</i>
Solin.	C. Julius Solinus, <i>Polyhistor</i>
Stat. S.	P. Papinius Statius, <i>Silvae</i>
Strab.	Στράβων (Strabo), Γεωγραφικά
Suet.	C. Suetonius Tranquillus
<i>Aug.</i>	<i>Vita Diui Augusti</i>
<i>Caes.</i>	<i>Vita Caesaris</i>
<i>Gramm.</i>	<i>De grammaticis</i>
<i>Vesp.</i>	<i>Vita Vespasiani</i>

Tac.	C. Cornelius Tacitus
Ann.	<i>Annales</i>
G.	<i>Germania</i>
Hist.	<i>Historiae</i>
Ter. Andr.	P. Terentius Afer (Terence), <i>Andria</i>
Tert.	Q. Septimius Tertullianus (Tertullian)
An.	<i>De anima</i>
Idol.	<i>De idolatria</i>
Monog.	<i>De monogamia</i>
Nat.	<i>Ad nationes</i>
Spect.	<i>De spectaculis</i>
Tib.	A. Albius Tibullus, <i>Elegiae</i>
Val. Max.	Valerius Maximus, <i>Facta dictaque memorabilia</i>
Varr.	M. Terentius Varro
L.L.	<i>De lingua latina</i>
R.R.	<i>De re rustica</i>
Verg.	P. Vergilius Maro (Virgil)
Aen.	<i>Aeneis</i>
Ecl.	<i>Eclogae</i>
Georg.	<i>Georgica</i>
Schol. Bern., Schol. Veron. in Verg.	<i>Scholia Bernensia, Veronensia in Vergilium</i>
Vitr.	M. Vitruvius Pollio, <i>De architectura</i>

OTHER ABBREVIATIONS

AC	<i>L'antiquité classique</i>
AGWG	<i>Abhandlungen der (königlichen) Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse</i>
AJA	<i>American Journal of Archaeology</i>
AJPh.	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
All.	<i>Archiv für lateinische Lexicographie</i>
ANF	<i>Arkiv för nordisk filologi</i>
APAW	<i>Abhandlungen der (königlichen) preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse</i>
ARW	<i>Archiv für Religionswissenschaft</i>

AV	<i>Atharva Veda</i>
Av.	<i>Avesta</i>
BAB	<i>Académie royale de Belgique, Bulletin de la classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques</i>
BCA	<i>Bulletino della Commissione archeologica municipale (comunale) di Roma</i>
BCH	<i>Bulletin de correspondance hellénique</i>
Bömer, <i>Fast.</i>	Franz Bömer, <i>Ovidius Naso, die Fasten</i> , 2 vols. 1957–58
BPhW	<i>Berliner philologische Wochenschrift</i>
BSL	<i>Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris</i>
Catalano	Perangelo Catalano
DA	<i>Contributi allo studio del diritto augurale</i> , vol. 1, 1960
SSR	<i>Linee del sistema sovranazionale romano</i> , vol. 1, 1965
CIL	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum</i>
Coll. Lat.	<i>Collection Latomus</i>
CPh.	<i>Classical Philology</i>
CQ	<i>Classical Quarterly</i>
CRAI	<i>Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres</i>
DA	Charles Darenberg and Edmond Saglio, <i>Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines</i>
Degrassi, <i>ILLR</i>	Attilio Degrassi, <i>Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei Publicae</i> , vol. 1, 1957, vol. 2, 1963
Dumézil	Georges Dumézil
Aspekte	<i>Aspekte der Kriegerfunktion bei den Indogermanen</i> , 1963 (<i>Aspects de la fonction guerrière chez les Indo-Européens</i> , 1956; <i>The Destiny of the Warrior</i> , 1970)
DIE	<i>Les dieux des Indo-Européens</i> , 1952
DL	<i>Déesses latines et mythes védiques</i> , 1956
Hér	<i>L'héritage indo-européen à Rome</i> , 1949
Idéol.	<i>L'idéologie tripartite des Indo-Européens</i> , 1958
IR	<i>Idées romaines</i> , 1969
JMQ	<i>Jupiter, Mars, Quirinus</i> , 4 vols., 1941–48
ME	<i>Mythe et épopée</i> , vol. 1, 1968
MV	<i>Mitra-Varuṇa</i> , 2d ed., 1948

NA	<i>Naissance d'Archanges, 1945</i>
NR	<i>Naissance de Rome, 1944</i>
QII	<i>Quaestiunculae indo-italicae, 1-16, 1958-61 (in REL and Lat.)</i>
RIER	<i>Rituels indo-européens à Rome, 1954</i>
Frazer, Fast.	James George Frazer, <i>The Fasti of Ovid</i> , 5 vols., 1919
HOS	Harvard Oriental Series
HThR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
IF	<i>Indogermanische Forschungen</i>
IJ	<i>Indo-Iranian Journal</i>
JA	<i>Journal asiatique</i>
JAOS	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
JRS	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
KZ	<i>(Kuhn's) Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung</i>
Lat.	<i>Latomus</i>
Latte	Kurt Latte, <i>Römische Religionsgeschichte</i> , 1960
LH	<i>Lettres d'humanité, Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé</i>
Lugli, RA	Giuseppe Lugli, <i>Roma antica, il Centro Monumentale</i> , 1946
MAAR	<i>Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome</i>
MAI	<i>Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres</i>
MAL	<i>Monumenti antichi dei Lincei</i>
Mattingly, RC	Harold Mattingly, <i>Roman Coins from the Earliest Times to the Fall of the Western Empire</i> , 1928
Mbh.	<i>Mahābhārata</i>
MEFR	<i>Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'École Française de Rome</i>
MH	<i>Museum Helveticum</i>
Mnem.	<i>Mnemosyne</i>
NS	<i>Notizie degli scavi</i>
BSR	<i>Papers of the British School at Rome</i>
Philol.	<i>Philologus</i>
Platner, TD	Samuel B. Platner (and T. Ashby), <i>A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome</i> , 1927 (= 1965)
MAAR	<i>Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome</i>

RA	<i>Revue archéologique</i>
RBPhH	<i>Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire</i>
RE	Georg Wissowa, Wilhelm Kroll, et al., <i>Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft</i>
REA	<i>Revue des études anciennes</i>
REL	<i>Revue des études latines</i>
RF	<i>Rivista di filologia</i>
RhM	<i>Rheinisches Museum für Philologie</i>
RHR	<i>Revue de l'histoire des religions</i>
RL	Wilhelm Roscher, <i>Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie</i>
RM	<i>Mitteilungen des (kaiserlichen) deutschen archaeologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung</i>
RPh.	<i>Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes</i>
RV	<i>RgVeda</i>
RVV	<i>Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten</i>
Śat.Brāhm.	<i>ŚatapathaBrāhmaṇa</i>
SBBA	<i>Sitzungsberichte der (königlichen) bayrischen Akademie, Philosophisch-historische Klasse</i>
SBHAW	<i>Sitzungsberichte der heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse</i>
SE	<i>Studi Etruschi</i>
SMSR	<i>Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni</i>
TAPhA	<i>Transactions of the American Philological Association</i>
Tlg.	<i>Tabulae Iguuinae</i>
Vetter	Emil Vetter, <i>Handbuch der italischen Dialekte</i> , vol. 1, 1953
Vid.	<i>Vidēvdāt</i>
Wiss.	Georg Wissowa, <i>Religion und Kultus der Römer</i> , 2d ed., 1912
Yt.	<i>Yašt</i>

PRELIMINARY REMARKS

1

UNCERTAINTY OF THE HISTORY OF THE FIRST CENTURIES

The history of the religion of the Roman Republic has for a long time shared in the relative stability which has been recognized in the entire written tradition of this meticulous people. To be sure, the learned men of antiquity and, relying on them, a number of Renaissance scholars, did express doubts, point out contradictions, and emphasize improbabilities. But this did not touch the heart of the matter: in the second book of his *De republica*, Cicero accepted without question the authenticity of each king of Rome, beginning with Romulus and Numa, although he was to neglect the fables which ornament the stories of the reigns. In consequence, European scholars felt somewhat reassured by the hesitations or by the frank declarations of skepticism with which Livy, Dionysius, and even Plutarch seasoned the history of the first centuries: was it useful or wise to disregard the criticism of the men who, with documents at their disposal, had sensibly evaluated them and, finally, had decided to use them while noting honestly the limits of their reliability? It was a French Huguenot, Louis de Beaufort, tutor to the prince of Hesse-Homburg and member of the Royal Society of London, who, in a book published at The Hague in 1738 (second edition, dedicated to the stadholder, 1750), coordinated and amplified the reasons for doubting, not only with Livy and Dionysius but against them, beyond the frontiers of their doubt.¹ He sifted the sources which they list, rejected as non-existent or falsified the *Annales Maximi* of the pontiffs, the *libri lintei*, and the Tables of the Censors, and allowed to stand only the Memorial

1. *Dissertation sur l'incertitude des cinq premiers siècles de l'histoire romaine*, new ed., with introduction and notes, by A. Blot (Paris, 1866). The four passages quoted below are respectively on pp. 13, 21, 23, and 179.

of the Families, which, however, he challenged as being brazenly misleading. He emphasized especially the text, indeed worthy of consideration, with which Livy opened his sixth book:

The history of the Romans from the founding of the City of Rome to the capture of the same—at first under kings and afterwards under consuls and dictators, decemvirs and consular tribunes—their foreign wars and their domestic dissensions, I have set forth in five books, dealing with matters which are obscure not only by reason of their great antiquity—like far-off objects which can hardly be descried—but also because in those days there was but slight and scanty use of writing, the sole trustworthy guardian of the memory of past events, and because even such records as existed in the commentaries of the pontiffs and in other public and private documents, nearly all perished in the conflagration of the City.

In what was reconstituted after the disaster, according to Livy, Beaufort scents deception:

Among the first decrees [the magistrates] passed was one for searching out the treaties and laws—to wit, the twelve tables and certain laws of the kings—so far as they could be discovered. Some of these were made accessible even to the common people, but such as dealt with sacred rites were kept private by the pontiffs, chiefly that they might hold the minds of the populace in subjection through religious fear.

The peace treaties? For those from the start of the Republic, Beaufort has no trouble in setting Polybius against Livy and in confounding one by means of the other. As for the laws and the books of the pontiffs, he says, "They did in truth serve to make known the constitution of the ancient government and to reveal the origin of certain customs or religious ceremonies; but beyond that they were of no help in establishing facts, disentangling events and fixing their dates, which is the essence of history."

It is remarkable that Beaufort did not push his advantage to its conclusion; in the second part of his book, in which "the uncertainty of the principal events of Roman history" is proved, until the torture of Regulus, he contents himself with stating that "nothing can be said with certainty about the founder of Rome," or about the period of its founding; like Cicero, however, he does not contest the authenticity of Romulus. Concerning the rape of the Sabine women, which seems improbable to him, he writes:

Is it believable that a prince, handsome and adorned with so many good qualities, as the historians represent Romulus to us, should have been reduced to the necessity of living in celibacy, if he had not had recourse to violence in order to have a wife? This is one of those episodes with which the first historians have seen fit to embellish Roman history; and once it was established, no matter how devoid of verisimilitude it might be, there has been reluctance to suppress it lest the history lose something thereby.

And similarly concerning the other kings, the "difficulties over the number of the tribes and over the age of the Tarquins," the war of Porsenna, etc.

It was reserved to German criticism of the nineteenth century to go beyond this well-bred skepticism, embarrassed by its own power and by the weapons with which it had equipped itself. Following Berthold Georg Niebuhr, Theodor Mommsen was not content to attribute to the first historians a preoccupation with "embellishing" Roman history; he began by appraising the material of these embellishments. In admirable essays he showed that many legends of the origins, and some of the most important ones, are explained as romantic projections into the past of events which occurred some centuries later. Since we have just read Beaufort's flimsy opinion concerning Rome's first war, the rape of the Sabine women, and that which ensued, I shall recall one of these demonstrations, which will also be useful in our own analyses. Mommsen's *Tatiuslegende* appeared in 1886 in *Hermes* and was reprinted in his *Gesammelte Schriften* (4 [1906]: 22-35). Here is the résumé, as well as the discussion, of this article which I made in 1944:

The principal reason for asserting the "Sabine component" in the origins of Rome² is the legend of the rape of the Sabine women and of the war between Romulus and Titus Tatius. There is no smoke without fire, it is said: however altered it may be in its details, this legend bears witness at least to an ancient contact between the two peoples. We shall see. One frees oneself rather quickly from certain remarks by Mommsen which, rather than the theses later formulated by Ettore Pais, continue to threaten to its roots the "Sabine component" of the origins of Rome. Mommsen has shown that in this particular case one may well observe some smoke without fire.

What should be understood by "the Sabines" of whom the legend speaks? Almost all the versions agree in explicitly giving this appellation its widest

2. This problem will be considered later, pp. 72-78.

meaning: namely, that the Sabines are not the inhabitants of the single city of Cures. If they spotlight Cures as the home of Titus Tatius and as the center of the coalition which was formed against Rome, and if a current, though certainly false, etymology connects *Quirites* with Cures, "the Sabines" are nonetheless the federated whole of the Sabine nation (Plut. *Rom.* 16.3 and 17.1; Dion. 2.36.3-4; cf. Liv. 1.9.9; 10.2; 30.6); in short, the Sabines are what will later be called the *nomen sabinum*.

This conception of the Sabines, however, involves the legend in gross contradictions. If it is to be extricated from these, one must ignore them, as is usually done; but criticism cannot be so accommodating. The synoecism which ended the war, the union of the two national cells with their institutional, religious, and other chromosomes, is conceivable only if the Rome of Romulus has as its partner a society of the same degree of greatness as itself, and not an entire federated nation which would overwhelm it. Moreover, the name of *rex Sabinorum* given to Tatius (Liv. 1.10.1, etc.) is not meaningful in the degree to which the Sabines are the *nomen sabinum*; in primitive Italy it is the particular *urbes* which have *reges*, and the chiefs of federations never bear this title. Further, the city of Cures itself, which according to the legend was essentially or totally engulfed by Rome, along with its king, its people, its riches, and its name (*Quirites*), nevertheless survived and retains its role in later history . . . Well?

Well, Mommsen has proposed a solution which remains seductive. As often happens, Rome seems to have made room in its early history for the prefiguration of an important episode in the history of the Republic. At the beginning of this third century which truly laid the foundation for its greatness, Rome, together with the already Romanized Latins, effectively allied itself, after a hard war, with the Samnites (291 B.C.), and, after a brief campaign, united with all the Sabine peoples; in 290, Rome gave to the latter the rights of citizenship *sine suffragio*, in 268 granted them full equality, and shortly afterward incorporated them into the newly constituted *Quirina* tribe. Is it not this union, of a type then new and of great consequence, which anachronistically gave form to the legend of Tatius, in which, despite the contradictions, the Romans saw the union of two "nationalities"? To be sure, when Mommsen uses the passage in which Servius (*Aen.* 7.709) affirms that the Sabines, once accepted into Rome, were citizens but without political rights, *ciues excepta suffragii latrone*, perhaps he pushes the analogy too far, for all the other authors, from Ennius and Varro to Plutarch and Appian, portray the fusion of the peoples of Romulus and of Tatius as one based on equal rights (cf. the well-founded criticism of Ettore Pais, *Storia critica di Roma* 1, 2 [1913]: 423); at least Servius, or rather his unknown source, thus demonstrates that the connections between the legend of the origins and the diplomatic event

of the third century were known to the Romans of the classical era: what does he do but reproduce exactly the agreement of 290, the first stage of the union? But there is hardly any need for such precision in the correspondence; the "myths" which justify events beforehand do not copy them in detail; what the annalists intended to signify and prefigure here was the total reconciliation and fusion of two traditionally hostile peoples, the Latins and the Sabines. The stages of the process were of minor importance; more useful was a striking abridgment. This is just what the historians give: in the third century "Rome" is a shortcut for designating the Latin nation, and "the Sabines" are the federated whole of the Sabine peoples, including Cures; and, by their treaties, these two partners realized what Livy says of the Romulus-Tatius agreement (1.13.4): *nec pacem modo sed ciuitatem unam ex duabus faciunt; regnum consociant, imperium omne conferunt Romam*—only with the slight alteration that the legend literally translates the phrase "*recipere in ciuitatem*" which, in the event of the third century, was purely abstract and did not imply immigration. It is easy to verify that this perspective resolves all the contradictions in the legend which were pointed out earlier.

To these statements Mommsen has added others which are of less interest because subjective appreciation appears more prominently in them. Moreover he gratuitously regards as secondary the connection between the Sabine war and the institution of the tribes, which is strongly affirmed by the whole tradition. He pushes to an extreme the "politisch-ätiologisch" character which he ascribes to the entire "Quasihistorie" of primitive Rome; he even seems to think that it is not only the matter of the narration, the political meaning of the account, and the name of the Sabines which date from the third century, but that the whole affair is a late, literary invention, and that no ancient tradition, with or without the Sabines, provided the annalists with primary material. These excesses in his conclusions should not lead one to disregard what is serious and striking in the principal pieces of the collection.³

We shall take up the examination of this legend later, at the point where Mommsen left it, and with other methods,⁴ but let us first note here the dates of the event set back in time by the fabricators of the history of Romulus: 290, 268. After Mommsen a considerable number of such anachronisms have been recognized, and they are all located between the second quarter of the fourth century and the end of the Samnite wars, roughly between 380 and 270. The reign of Ancus Marcius, and especially his name, doubtless owes much to the

3. NR, pp. 145-48; I am grateful to Editions Gallimard for permission to reproduce this long quotation, as well as those on pp. 66-73 and pp. 116-17.

4. Below, pp. 72-78.

rise of the *gens Marcia* in the middle of the fourth century and to the events of this period. Ancus is said to have founded Ostia and to have created salt marshes around it (Liv. 1.33.9). The colony of Ostia was actually founded somewhere around 335 (Carcopino) and it was near the saltworks of Ostia that Marcius Rutilius, the first plebeian to be dictator and censor, defeated the Etruscans in 356. Ancus is said to have installed the conquered inhabitants of Politorium on the Aventine (ibid. 2). It has been authenticated that the Aventine was populated in 340. Certain aspects of the "policy" of Servius Tullius (who is supported by the *primores patrum* and favors the *plebs* [Liv. 1.41.6 and 49.2; 46.1]) opposed to that of Tarquin the Old (who relies on the *patres minorum gentium* and the *equites* [ibid. 35.6 and 35.2 and 7]) seem to be composed after the circumstances of the famous censorship of Appius Claudius (312-308). The Servian organization which Livy describes in 1.43 is not earlier than the fourth century, and the estimate of the sums of money mentioned at the time of this king's census seems to be based on monetary values at the end of the fourth century and the beginning of the third. As for the legend of Romulus himself, the authenticated establishment of a temple to Jupiter Stator was made in 294, and it is in the theological ensemble deployed before the battle of Sentinum (295) that Romulus, with his twin, is attested for the first time in his traditional rank of Quirinus—and this god receives a temple in 293 on the Quirinal, in place of the old *sacellum* with which he had been contented until then.

The ingenuity of an Ettore Pais and of some others has pushed this quest for anachronisms very far, too far, but the grouping of the greater number of the more probable ones between 380 and 270 allows us to think that it was at this late time that royal history as Ennius knew it and as we still read it received its definitive form. For the first centuries of the Republic, the "uncertainty" is just as great, and it is aggravated by the falsifications of the great families. The war with Veii, the Gallic drama, and the entire career of Furius Camillus are known to us only through reworkings which do not allow us to sense the actual events. Even those of the fourth century are often disturbing, and it is scarcely until the second half of that century that Roman history begins to display itself, in the rough, with the minimum of purity required by this great word.

It is another form of involuntary anachronism which complicates

the study, not so much of events but of customs, of civilization. The annalists and their heirs the historians, despite some touches of archaism, do not try to imagine the ancient Romans of whom they speak otherwise than with the traits of their own contemporaries. Anticipating the Augustan poets, they speak, in general terms, of the humbleness of the beginnings; but their Numa, their Ancus, and Publicola and Servius live, calculate, and create as they would in the Rome of the Scipios and the Catos. Contrary to all probability, the armies engaged in the earliest battles are the later legions, except for the exact number of men; at the height of the struggle in the Forum, Romulus vows a temple to Jupiter; and, from the beginnings, Senate and mob are in opposition and trick each other as they will do until the time of the Empire. What we call the first Romans, the famous soldier-workers, are at best no more than Catos, made older by four hundred years, like the peasant paintings in Dalecarlia which portray scenes from the Gospels in a Skansen setting and with people in costumes still worn in that part of Sweden on Sundays.

Such being the texts, modern historians accord them more or less credit, reduce or enlarge the degree of uncertainty, according to the natural inclination of their own spirits or by virtue of prejudices founded on other considerations, rather than for reasons arising from the material itself.⁵

Do other sources of information compensate for this weakness of the annalistic tradition?

There is almost no foreign testimony: the Greeks did not speak of the Romans until much later, and the first ones to do so at some length had more imagination and more enthusiasm, but not more archives or more critical ability than the Romans themselves. The opening of Plutarch's *Romulus* shows well enough what their work was able to do—the multiplying of fables, among which the national tradition soberly made its choice. For the Etruscan period, a unique and very important document, the frescoes of the François Tomb at Vulci, conveys simultaneously a stunning confirmation of the existence of a mercenary soldier named Mastarna, that is, Servius Tullius,

5. See the sensible reflection of P. Fraccaro, "The History of Rome in the Regal Period," *JRS* 47 (1957): 59–65. On the "linen books," see R. M. Ogilvie, "Licinius Macer and *libri lintei*," *JRS* 48 (1958): 40–46.

as the head of Rome, and of the Vipina brothers, that is, Vibenna; and the proof that the Roman portrayal of the event and of the reign of this same Mastarna differed completely from the Etruscan presentation. The latter, less concerned and composed among a people who were at the time more literate, is probably closer to reality.

Epigraphy is silent; with rare exceptions, of which only a very important one directly concerns religion,⁶ nothing exists in written form, either on stone or on tufa, from the first four centuries of Rome, and it is only in the second century B.C. that the collections make a substantial contribution to our knowledge of Roman civilization and history.

There remains archaeology, the balance sheet of the methodical exploration of the site of Rome, which has been pursued for almost a century, and which in the past twenty-five years has taken on most promising dimensions. With regard to history, the results of archaeological investigations are of the first importance. Not in details, to be sure, but in the overall picture and primarily in chronology, they restore credit to the principal dates and to the general divisions of annalistic tradition which mere examination of the texts does not corroborate. Here briefly is the picture.⁷

6. Below, p. 84.

7. I recapitulate the clear summation of Raymond Bloch, *Les origines de Rome* (Club du Livre Français, 1959), pp. 63-100, where the essentials of the bibliography will be found. On the archaeological data of the Palatine and the Forum, see the works of S. M. Puglisi, notably "Gli abitatori primitivi del Palatino attraverso le testimonianze archeologiche e le nuove indagini stratigrafiche sul Germalo," *MAL* 41 (1951), cols. 1-138; "Nuovi resti sepolcrali nella valle del Foro Romano," *Bullettino di paleontologia italiana*, n.s. 8, no. 4 (1952): 5-17. Einar Gjerstad, after a complete reexamination of the excavations, has been working for thirteen years on a monumental corpus of the archaeology of the site of Rome: *Early Rome* (Acta Instituti Romani Regni Sueciae, 1st ser. vol. 17): vol. 1, *Stratigraphical Researches in the Forum Romanum and along the Sacra Via* (1953); vol. 2, *The Tombs* (1956); vol. 3, *Fortifications, Domestic Architecture, Sanctuaries, Stratigraphic Excavations* (1960); vol. 4, pts. 1 and 2, *Synthesis of Archaeological Evidence* (1966). The author supports a revolutionary chronology, still being debated by the archaeologists, which was set forth around 1952 in the article "Scavi Stratigrafici nel Foro Romano e problemi ad essi relativi," *BCA* 73 (1949-50): 3-19. In his latest book the author displays traces of Bronze Age culture which would extend the prehistory of the site to about 1500 B.C. Among his opponents I mention A. von Gerkan, "Zur Frühgeschichte Roms," *RhM* 100 (1957): 82-97; "Das frühe Rom nach E. Gjerstad," *RhM* 104 (1961): 132-48; reply by E. Gjerstad, "Discussions concerning Early Rome," *Opuscula Romana* 3 (1960). In any case, the use of the legends made by Gjerstad is not acceptable, "Legends and Facts of Early Roman History," *Studier, Kungliga humanistiska vetenskapssamfundet i Lund* (1960-61), p. 2. See especially H. Müller-Karpe, *Vom Anfang Roms*, *RM*, supplement 5 (1959), and M. Pallottino, who has reviewed and criticized a large number of recent publications in "Fatti e leggende (moderne) sulla più antica storia di Roma," *SE* 31 (1963): 3-37.

Despite indications of earlier human presence, it is not until the middle of the eighth century that several elevated points of the Palatine were permanently occupied by villages, direct traces of which can still be seen. The existence of somewhat later establishments on the Esquiline and on the Quirinal is hypothetical, deduced from the existence of a rather large necropolis on the former and of five isolated tombs on the latter. It is only in the seventh century, starting in 670, and with a disruption due to floods, that the settlement was extended to the valley of the Forum, which until then had been used for burials. Starting in 650, the Quirinal, Viminal, and Capitoline offer rich votive deposits, the *fauissae*, attesting the existence of cult places, whether constructed or not, which were used for considerable periods. The principal *fauissa* of the Quirinal, for example, near the eighth-century tombs, contains pottery which dates down to about 580. From the middle of the sixth century to the beginning of the fifth, a clear change in archaeological material sends us incontestably to Etruria, and testifies that Rome went through the period of Etruscan hegemony and wealth which the annalistic tradition describes. The basement of the Capitoline temple with three *cellae* attributed to the Tarquins has vestiges which date from the start of the sixth century; and some fragments of drains, perhaps of walls, date from the same period. If the dates which these discoveries impose do not coincide with the limits which annalistic tradition ascribes to the Etruscan kingship, the essential facts are nonetheless confirmed; confirmed also, by the disappearance, around 480, of the luxury represented by imported Greek pottery, is the return of Rome to its strict Latinity in the first quarter of the fifth century.

All this is extremely valuable; it reveals a history which clarifies certain cultic facts not accounted for by the annalistic tradition. For example, the annual festival of the Septimontium (Fest. p. 439 l. 7)¹¹ was celebrated every 11 December; in this festival sacrifices were offered by the dwellers on the three highest points of the Palatine, those on the three highest points of the Esquiline, and, seventh, those of Suburra, excluding the people of the Quirinal, the Viminal,

11. There is discussion (and has been since antiquity; for example, Lyd. *Mens.* 4.155) on the topographical definition of the seven primitive *montes*, and even on the name. Cf. A. Holland, "Septimontium or Saepimontium?" *TAPhA* 84 (1953): 16-34. See now J. Poucet, "Le Septimontium et la Succusa chez Festus et chez Varro, un problème d'histoire et de topographie romaines," *Bulletin de l'Institut Belge de Rome* 32 (1960): 25-73.

the Capitol, the Aventine, and, at river level, the Forum. The federation thus defined agrees with the state of settlement at the beginning of the seventh century which can be read from the ground itself, if, as is probable, the Esquiline was occupied shortly after the Palatine.

If archaeology thus confirms the outlines of royal history, it indirectly weakens some of its claims. There is general agreement that until about 575 Rome was considerably less prosperous than the neighboring Etruscan cities, despite its commercial traffic with Falerii and Caere, of which there is ceramic evidence, and that it was incapable of the conquests and the expansion for which the annalists give credit to the kings Tullus and Ancus, not to mention Romulus. The destruction of Alba by the first is a fiction, as the opening of the port of Ostia by the second is an anachronism. This negative assurance is also welcome.

But the information provided by archaeology has its natural limitations. The excavations do not permit us even to glimpse the unfolding of events, of which they uncover only the results; moreover, they do not inform us, whatever one may say, of the most important element in the study of civilization and religion: the origin and nationality of the men who occupied the *montes* and the *colles*, the homogeneity or duality of the most ancient settlement. We shall have to reexamine this point, this option which controls the interpretation of religious origins. To these we must now return.

2

POLITICAL HISTORY AND RELIGIOUS HISTORY

One of the fortunate circumstances in the study of religious facts has been that Mommsen, the very man who promoted most successfully the criticism of the legends of the first centuries of Rome, and after him another great man, his disciple Georg Wissowa, felt that the uncertainty of political and military history did not automatically entail that of religious history. A few reflections will quickly make us realize this relative independence. While the political and military past, save in the laws and treaties which have resulted from it, is a product of the recorded or manufactured past, and is without practical use, religion is always and everywhere an actual and active thing; its rites are celebrated daily or annually, its concepts and its gods intervene in the routine of peaceful times as well as in the fever of times of crisis. Moreover at Rome, for a long time if not always, religion gave employment to numerous persons, groups of specialists who from generation to generation passed on the rules of the cult and who were supervised by the *pontifex*. When temples were raised, the date of consecration and the circumstances of the vow could hardly be forgotten. Even a terrible blow like the Gallic disaster can hardly have interfered with such traditions, which were simple ones, and, in their ritual aspects, were kept alive by practice. Finally, until the great priesthoods had become strategic positions in the struggles between classes or factions, religious science, all-important and all-present as it was, remained autonomous, subject only to its own rules and its internal logic. As a result it was less exposed to the falsifying ventures of pride or ambition than was the recital of secular events. Briefly, to limit ourselves to a few striking examples, the history of the Tarquins may be only a tissue of fables, but the authenticity of the Capitoline

cult which they bequeathed to the Republic is not thereby compromised. It was certainly not Numa who created the offices of the great flamens, and especially not the first, the flamen of Jupiter; this does not prevent the motive which the annalists give for this creation—to relieve the *rex* of the greater part of the religious duties which were incompatible with his necessary freedom of action—from expressing an affinity between the *rex* and the *flamen Dialis* and, beyond the priest, between the *rex* and Jupiter. Such an affinity is entirely consistent with what we know of the actual status of the flamen.

On the other hand, apart from all theory, Mommsen and Wissowa understood that a religion would not be essentially, at any given moment, an anarchic accumulation of conceptions and prescriptions brought together by accident. To be sure, from one end of its history to the other, Rome shows a remarkable aptitude for absorbing whatever religiously powerful gods and festivals its circumstances and surroundings offered it; but whatever it takes thus, it annexes, with precautions, to a preexisting and already rich national patrimony, in which natural divisions and partial structures are easily seen, if not a unitary plan. Wissowa's manual has been criticized for its systematic arrangement. But this plan results from the nature of the material. It matters little that this author has labeled the two principal divisions of his study—ancient gods and imported gods—with the names *Indigetes* and *Nouensiles*. These names have been misinterpreted as meaning “indigenous” and “newly installed,” an error which is displeasing to the eye because it is repeated in the running heads of 222 odd-numbered pages; however, one quickly realizes that it has practically no importance and does not prevent the division from being useful.

Finally Mommsen and Wissowa were imperturbably indifferent to the ephemeral theories which succeeded one another during their lives regarding the nature, the origin, and the stereotyped evolution of religious facts: the solar mythology of Max Müller or the animism of Tylor, the spirits of vegetation of Mannhardt and his disciples, or Salomon Reinach's totemism—all aroused the defiance of these exact and precise scholars. Wissowa's resistance was doubtless not without *hubris*, and one must regret the summary execution which he performed, at the end of a footnote, on the author of *The Golden*

Bough.¹ But this excessive reservedness or, if you will, obstinacy, is worth more than the fads, both before and after *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, which have produced so many studies that are outmoded as soon as they are written. Wissowa's manual needs to be brought up to date and, with regard to its doctrine, corrected in large part. Nevertheless it remains the best; it has not been replaced.

Those who have applied to the interpretation of Roman religion the successively or simultaneously fashionable theories of the last century have all posed, explicitly or not, an identical postulate: namely, that the earliest Romans, concerning whom tradition says absolutely nothing valid, were "primitives," comparable on an intellectual level to the peoples of America, Africa, and Melanesia, who have been observed for only two or three hundred years, most of them for only one hundred, and who belong not to the historians but to the ethnographers. Their religion, then, should be cast in the molds which each school regards as primitive; and it is from these elementary forms, by the process of evolution, that the religion professed by the grandchildren of these "primitives," the Romans whom we know through the classical authors, should have emerged.

It must be recognized that the innovators have found accomplices to their theories in the classical authors. It is a commonplace of the Augustan epoch to contrast the luxury, the complexity of life during the great reign, with the simplicity, the truly elemental, almost embryonic character of primitive Rome, not only in habitat and customs but in political institutions and cults. If one is to believe these authors, Rome seven centuries before Augustus was nothing but a few hundred shepherds on the Palatine. It will also be recognized that archaeology reinforces this impression. Seeing the few traces of huts, tiny and irregular, that are shown to him, what visitor to the Palatine does not repeat with Propertius (4.1.9-10):

*Qua² gradibus domus ista Remi se sustulit olim
Unus erat fratrum maxima regna focus . . . ?*

Who does not wonder how one of these *casae* could have sheltered two brothers and a hearth at the same time? In such miserable

1. Wiss., p. 248, n. 3.

2. Var. *quod, quo*.

dwelling it is hard to imagine a life which was not entirely occupied by the most pressing needs, in which there would have been enough freedom of thought to conceive, organize, and preserve a theology above the "primitive" level, however one imagines it.

Nevertheless we must resist this temptation. To judge from what remains of Emain Macha in Ireland, or from the twenty circular huts which stand at the foot of *Caer y Twr*, near Holyhead in Anglesey, and from many other sites, it is hard to imagine that there existed in these Celtic countries a body of druids whose studies—theology, ritual, law, and epic traditions—lasted up to twenty years. Over how many archaeological excavations does not one experience the same astonishment! The Latins who settled on the Palatine were not, any more than their Celtic cousins, new men with everything to create and discover for themselves. They were, and their language proves it, the descendants of invaders from distant parts, coming by stages, and we cannot today regard them as primitives. Here for the first time we must write a name which will recur frequently in this book: they were Indo-Europeans who used the same word for politico-or magico-religious concepts as the Vedic Indians or the oldest Iranians at the other end of the Indo-European sphere, sometimes the same word as the Celts used for the same or closely related concepts. Not to speak of religion, which will be our subject matter, it is remarkable that the head of the primitive Roman society bears the old Indo-European title **rēg-*, like that of the Vedic society (*rāj[an]*), and like that of all the ancient Celtic societies (*rīg-*). This single fact proves that the dwellers in the cabins on the Tiberine *montes* were not groups of inorganic families who were to be associated, at the end of a certain period, in creating new institutions, but rather that they had arrived with a suprafamilial structure and a traditional political organization. How indeed can one suppose that these men who had inherited from a distant past the idea as well as the word *rex* could have allowed it to fall into disuse and then have reactivated it, under the same name?

If then we do not directly know the Latin *rēx*, comparison with the Irish *rí* and the Vedic *rāj(an)* allows us to imagine with some clarity what the Indo-European **rēg-* was, from which they are derived. The function of the *rāj(an)* is not, as was formerly proposed, "derived" from that of the head of the family. Like the *rí*, he transcends social

divisions, represents powers, and has duties and rights which cannot pass as mere amplification of the status of the head of a family. Like the *rí* with his personal druid, he lives and functions symbiotically with an eminent representative of the priestly class, the brahman who is his chaplain, his *puróhita*, and who gives back to him in mystical protection what he gives out of generosity. Not only is his consecration an important religious ceremony, but he has at his disposal an entire range of appropriately royal ceremonies, notably the sacrifice of the horse which makes him a kind of super-king—just as Ireland recognizes an *ardrí* at the head of its hierarchy of *ríg*. The Roman *rex* must not have had a very different relationship to the social body over which he presided. If what we know of his shadowy descendant in the time of the Republic, the *rex sacrorum*, is not enough to give the measure of this difference, at least the solidarity of the *rex* with the most highly placed of the flamens (Liv. 1.20.2) recalls that of the *rāj(an)* or of the *rí* with their principal brahman or druid;³ besides, republican Rome preserved a meaningful connection, which will be studied later, between the annual sacrifice of the horse and, lacking the king himself, the “house of the king,” the Regia, in a ritual whose symbolism is close to that of the Indian *asvamedha*.⁴ The exact correspondence of personages who bear the same title, and whose wives likewise have as their titles archaic derivatives of this word (with a suffix *n*: Latin *rēgina*, Vedic *rājñī*-, Irish *rígain*), cannot be the result of chance. There has been a continuity from an Indo-European structure to the Roman structure which we know, and the societies of the Palatine, the Esquiline, etc., displayed the traditional complex organization, with a *rex* duplicated religiously by the first *flamen*, and traditional royal ceremonies, to whose existence the final placement of the tail and head of the *Equus October* in a Regia transplanted to the Forum still bears witness.

I confine myself here to these considerations. They suffice to suggest, not the inaccuracy, but rather the incompleteness of the idea held by Frazer of the Latin kingship, in the line of the *Wald- und Feldkulte*, that the essential element of its office was magical control of the fecundity of nature.

3. See below, pp. 151–53 and 580–82.

4. See below, pp. 226–27.

3

THE MOST ANCIENT ROMAN RELIGION: *NUMEN* OR *DEUS*?

Leaving aside the fantasies based on totemism, which nobody defends any more, as well as the doctrines of Mannhardt, which we should endeavor not so much to refute as to integrate, in their limited place, in a more general and better-balanced view of Roman religion, we must halt before the only one of these theories which still, in various forms, holds the spotlight in many books. This is the theory which has been called, by an artificial and negative word, predeism,¹ or, more recently, by an expressive and more suitable term, dynamism. In the origin of religious representations, it stresses a belief in a power diffused or rather dispersed throughout numerous material supports, and acting at once roughly and automatically, a belief that should have been older than the notions of personal gods and even spirits, considered as products evolved from it.

The observation of the Melanesians furnished this doctrine with its point of departure. In 1891, in his book *The Melanesians* (p. 118 as quoted in H. J. Rose, *Ancient Roman Religion*, p. 13), Bishop Codrington gave a definition of the *mana* which has since flourished:

The Melanesian mind is entirely possessed by the belief in a supernatural power or influence, called almost universally *mana*. This is what works to effect everything which is beyond the ordinary power of men, outside of the common processes of nature; it is present in the atmosphere of life, attaches

1. K. Vahlert, *Praedeismus und römische Religion*, Diss. Frankfurt (1935). In this form, the theory has hardly any supporters. Specialists in the history of religion may regard the following discussion (pp. 18-46) as useless: they have long known that "primitive" thought is not such. But the assertions of H. J. Rose, A. Grenier, and others continue to impress many classicists who are less aware of the results of modern ethnography.

itself to persons and things, and is manifested by results which can only be ascribed to its operation.

In 1926 H. J. Rose, an English Latinist, was enlightened by this revelation of the most elemental form of the sacred. He quickly amassed materials by which to prove that this same conception dominates Roman religion and, taken back to the origins, explains its entire development.² He sought the name which the Romans gave to the *mana* and found it: it is *numen*. Rose's influence was considerable in the ensuing quarter of a century.³ At Utrecht he received strong support in the person of H. Wagenvoort, whose book *Imperium: Studien over het mana-begrip in zede en taal der Romeinen* (1941)⁴ Rose translated under the title *Roman Dynamism* (1947). In France, A. Grenier gave Rose enthusiastic approval.⁵ Some prominent Hellenists, won over by the contagion, have undertaken to identify the *mana* in their domain, and have found it under a name just as unexpected as *numen*. It is, they say, *δαίμων*.

Various indications lead us to believe that the height of the craze has passed and that the theory will not long survive its promoter, who died in 1961. It still holds strong positions, however, and must be examined with care. Here is how Rose stated it in 1926 (*Primitive Culture in Italy*, pp. 44-45), after defining classical Roman theology, "except for one or two great gods," as a "polydaemonism," that is, an accumulation of beings, each capable of accomplishing a single action but without any existence, beyond their specialty, either in the cult or in the imagination:

... They are not so much gods as particular manifestations of *mana*. Spinenis provided the *mana* necessary to get thorn-bushes (*spinae*) out of people's fields; Cinxia, that needed for the proper girding (*cingere*) of the bride; and so with innumerable others. What stories could anyone tell about such phantasmal, uninteresting beings as these?

2. Before Rose, Frederic Pfister, *BPhW* 40 (1920): 648.

3. I have had occasion several times to debate, not very pleasantly, with this author, notably *RHR* 133 (1947-48): 241-43; *DL*, pp. 41 and n. 2, 118-23.

4. I have examined chapter 4 of this book in "Maiestas et grauitas, de quelques différences entre les Romains et les Austronésiens," *RPh* 26 (1952): 7-28; (see now *IR*, pt. 1, chap. 6) whence an exchange: H. Wagenvoort, "Grauitas et maiestas," *Mnem.*, 4th ser., 5 (1952): 187-306; G. Dumézil, "Maiestas et grauitas, II," *RPh*. 28 (1954): 19-20; cf. O. Hiltbrunner, "Vir grauis," *Festschrift A. Debrunner* (1954), pp. 195-206. I shall shortly examine two other chapters of *Roman Dynamism*.

5. "Observations sur l'un des éléments primordiaux de la religion romaine," *Lat.* 6 (1947): 297-308.

The Latin word for them, or for their power, is interesting; it is *numen*. The literal meaning is simply "a nod," or more accurately, for it is a passive formation, "that which is produced by nodding," just as *flamen* is "that which is produced by blowing," i.e., a gust of wind. It came to mean "the product or expression of power"—not, be it noted, power itself. Properly speaking, the gods, and sometimes other powers more than human, or than ordinary humanity, have *numen*; but as their business is just to have *numen* and nothing more, they are themselves often called by that name, especially in the plural, *numina*. As the theological thought of Rome advances, the work takes on a higher meaning, and comes to signify "divinity," "deity"; but we are not now concerned with this part of its development.

But it might well be said that to conceive of a spirit of any sort, even if he does nothing more exalted than to give farmers, from time to time, power to perform successfully the important business of manuring their fields (over which the god Stercutius presided), represents a not inconsiderable effort of abstract thought. Indeed, priestly theologians in Rome laid hold of these ancient *numina* and extended and classified them, adding many of their own invention, until they might almost be said to form a list of the detailed functions of Deity in general, or of the various ways in which his help might be sought. But their history can be traced back to a much lower stage than that, indeed to nothing higher than the savage concept of *mana* locally resident in some place, or in some material object.

Later, in *Ancient Roman Religion*, published in 1950 (pp. 21-22), Rose claimed that he could specify how the ancient Romans, starting with this notion of *numen-mana*, arrived at the conception of personal gods:

Since *numen* is found in sundry places and attached to various persons and things, it is not remarkable that its manifestations were sometimes less and sometimes more potent. If they were strong, and especially if they were regular in their occurrence, the natural conclusion would be that they were produced by a kind of person who had much *numen* and was ready to display it for the benefit of those who approached him in the proper manner. This person was a god or goddess, and concerning the nature of these beings the Roman, left to his own devices, seems to have had a great incuriosity.

Before examining this thesis and the principal facts which have been advanced to support it, it is proper to recall two fundamental concepts in the study of religions.

The first is that in all religions, including the most highly developed, the faithful practitioners do not all practice their faith on the same

level; on the contrary, a wide range of “interpretations” can be shown in a single epoch or in a single society, often extending from pure automatism to the subtlest mysticism. Mircea Eliade has made an excellent formulation of this observation:

The manipulation of the sacred is, by itself, an ambivalent operation, particularly in this sense, that the sacred may be tested or experienced, whether on the religious level or on the magical level, without the manipulator’s necessarily being clearly aware of what he is performing—an act of worship or a magical performance. The coexistence of the magical and of the religious within a single consciousness is moreover extremely frequent. The same Australian who knows that there is a supreme being (Daramulun, Baiame, or Mungangao) living in the sky, whom he invokes during initiation ceremonies, practices magic assiduously, a magic in which none of the gods is present. A present-day Christian prays to Jesus Christ and to the Virgin Mary, which does not prevent him from occasionally manipulating the sacred images (for example, if there is a severe drought) for purely magical purposes. Thus the immersion of sacred statues is supposed to bring rain, etc.⁶

Still more: the same individuals and the best-educated, according to circumstances, “practice” on various levels, sometimes with the insights of theology, sometimes with a simple, voluntarily childlike trust in the efficacy of their actions or their words. Thus every religion, of whatever kind, continues to produce, as long as it exists, attitudes and behavior which may equal or surpass in simplicity those of the primitives, not merely in appearance but in reality. One must, however, guard against seeing in such attitudes and behavior a survival, much less the origin or the remains of a pattern from which everything else has evolved. That which is typologically primitive may not be chronologically so. Doubtless it would be better to speak of “rough” or “inferior” forms, using these terms, however, without a pejorative connotation.

The second concept, bound up with the preceding one, which the student should bear in mind is that the concrete apparatus by which religions materialize the invisible or enter into communication with it is limited. To live his faith, man makes use only of his sensory organs and limbs, and to portray the object of that faith he uses only the resources of his industry. We shall return shortly to the portrayals,

6. *Les techniques du Yoga* (1948), p. 227.

but shall consider here only the actions. The godfather and godmother at a baptism touch their godchild just as the Roman magistrate touched the doorpost of the temple which he was inaugurating. The communicant consumes the host in the same way as the faithful in a great number of cults on every level consume a sacred food, animal or vegetable. The confirming bishop slaps the candidate for confirmation just as the ancient Roman, in the ceremony of manumission known as *festuca*, gave a slap to the person whom he was manumitting, and just as the brahmans, in the Indian ceremony of royal consecration, struck the king. And so on. This does not mean that here and there the level, the intention, the very motive of the ceremony are the same. There is a considerable difference between the ideological substratum of the eucharistic communion as practiced by the Catholic who believes in the actual presence and as practiced by the Protestant who sees in the Lord's Supper nothing but a commemoration; there is an even greater difference between what both expect as a spiritual profit from this act and the physical and racial strengthening which a totemic food is claimed to give to whoever consumes it. I doubt that the godparents imagine they are communicating a fluid to the baby whom they touch; their action simply shows that they are speaking and pledging themselves in its name—it is not efficacious, but symbolic. Wagenvoort wrote an entire and very interesting chapter on *contactus*, the ritual actions involving touch, in Roman religion. But if it is possible that the touch of the consecrator of a temple (*postem tenere*) transmits a force, I doubt that this would be true of the touch of the general who performs the *deuotio*, during which, among other elements of a complex setting (a veil over his head, his hand on his chin), he must stand on a spear. One should thus be circumspect in one's interpretation of a ritual action concerning which there is no explicit and reliable textual commentary. Unfortunately, this is usually the case with Roman rites.

Having said this, we cannot deny that many of the features of our Roman documentation conspire to give the religion a "primitive" appearance. Some relate to particular gods, others to the general characteristics of the gods. The former, to which the school of H. J. Rose assigns the greatest importance, and which concern Mars and Jupiter, are not, however, the most striking.

If one goes along with Rose and his followers, Mars was at first only a lance, and Jupiter, at least under one of his principal aspects, a stone, each object carrying in itself an appreciable supply of *mana*. We shall confine ourselves to a discussion of Mars and his lance, or lances. There are two kinds of facts here.⁷

On the one hand, at Rome, as in other Latin cities, one or more *hasta(e) Martis* were preserved, which sometimes moved by themselves, apparently making a noise and thus announcing dangerous happenings. Following the official announcements of prodigies the historians often comment: *hastae Martis in Regia sponte sua motae sunt*.

What do the words *sponte sua* mean? The primitivists interpret them strictly: it is by their own power, by their *mana*, without divine intervention that the lances shake, thus preserving in historical times a predeistic representation, a witness of the time when a personal god had not yet freed himself from the *mana* of the weapon. However one may understand *sponte sua*, this interpretation is not legitimate. It is in fact possible that the lances shake "by themselves," in the literal sense of the word. But this belief would recall an order of representations known among religions which are far removed from primitivism. In Scandinavia, for example, at the end of the pagan era, the *Njálssaga* (30.21) speaks of the halberd of Hallgrímr which made a loud sound whenever a man was going to be killed by it, "so great was the power of magic—*náttúra* [*Zauberkraft*, designated by the Latin word *natura*!]*—*which there was in it." Like this halberd, the *hastae* would simply be magical objects, and this banal statement would not inform us about the evolution of theology or the origin of Mars any more than the spontaneous noise made by the halberd explains the origin of the gods of battle, Óðinn and Þórr. Since, however, the lances are always presented as "the lances of Mars," a personal god of whom it is hard to deny that he has some connection with battle, another interpretation recommends itself. The words *sponte sua* in the catalogs of prodigies are not intended to deny the intervention of the invisible god but only that of men and of any palpable agency or motive power; thus they would mean "without

7. Here I develop and improve a discussion from my *DIE*, pp. 111-17. A good criticism of *numen-mana* by S. Weinstock appeared in *JRS* 39 (1949): 166-67; another, by P. Boyancé, in the *Journal des Savants*, 1948, pp. 69-78, and in *L'information littéraire*, May-June 1955, pp. 100-107.

having been touched or moved by any person." There is no lack of parallels for this use of the expression. In the fifteenth book of the *Metamorphoses* Ovid recounts the birth of Tages, the tiny mannikin who is said to have founded Etruscan divination and who emerged one day from a clod of earth under the astonished eyes of a peasant at work in his fields (lines 553-59). According to the poet, the poor rustic "saw in his fields a clod, big with fate [*fatalem glaebam*], first moving of its own accord, and with no one touching it, then taking on the form of man and losing its earthy shape, and finally opening its new-made mouth to speak things that were to be."

sponte sua primum nulloque agitante moueri . . .

Tages is born in the manner of mice, who were thought to be produced by the earth. But in the first stage of the operation, before the clod is, so to say, delivered of his child, the laborer sees only one thing: the unexplained movement of this clod, *nullo agitante*, untouched by anyone human, anyone of our world. *Sponte sua* merely duplicates *nullo agitante* and apparently does not preclude what the second stage of the process shows, namely, that someone on the inside, a little supernatural being, is moving the clod. The same may be true of the "spontaneous" movement of the lances, with the unseen Mars setting them in motion. Many facts recommend a preference for this interpretation, notably the following. Livy (22.1.11) relates that at Falerii, shortly before the disaster of Lake Trasimene, *sortes sua sponte attenuatas unamque excidisse ita scriptam: "Mauors telum suum concutit."* Plainly what we have here is a warning, a threat equivalent to those received at Rome or at Lanuvium (Liv. 21.62.4: the lance of Juno), or at Praeneste (Liv. 24.10.10), when the lance or lances move; only, at Falerii, it is the divination tablets which move perceptibly and "by themselves," and the shaking of the weapon by the invisible Mars is only declared, not observed. By way of compensation, however, the agent of this movement is also declared: it is the god himself. Thus at Rome, where only the god is invisible and the lances are seen, it is still he who moves them when they move "themselves." To sum up, the movement of the lances either suggests the magic which in all places and times is juxtaposed with religion, or else it is to be explained, in terms of "deism," by the action of Mars. In neither case does anything suggest that this is a survival of "pre-

deism," a vestige of a conception antedating Mars and from which Mars might have issued.

The second fact connected with the lance or lances of Mars, from which the primitivists draw important conclusions, is the ritual procedure performed by the Roman general before he entered on a campaign (Servius *Aen.* 8.3). He betook himself to the chapel in the Regia consecrated to this god, shook first the sacred bucklers which hung there, and then the lance of the statue itself, *hastam simulacri ipsius*, saying, "Mars, uigila!" It is very probable, as has been remarked, that the setting of the rite is given by Servius in a relatively recent form: in ancient times Mars no more had a statue than did the other gods. This then must have been not a lance held in the hand of a *simulacrum* which the general touched, but a separate, detached lance, sufficient to itself. Two alternative conclusions by the primitivists: in the oldest times Mars himself did not serve as mediator, and the entire transaction was between the general and a lance charged with *mana*; or the lance was itself Mars and had, by the process of evolution, produced a vague personal god who was still partially embodied in it. They have supported their theory with a text by Plutarch (*Rom.* 29.2) which says, in a hasty and poorly constructed sentence, that there was in the Regia a lance "which was called Mars" (ἐν δὲ τῇ 'Ρηγίᾳ δόρυ καθιδρυμένον Ἄρεα προσαγορεύειν), and with a passage of Arnobius (6.11) which follows Varro in noting that the earliest Romans had *pro Marte hastam*. On the basis of these brief indications and of the general's action, a prehistory of Mars has been constructed in three phases: first, an inanimate lance was charged with *mana*, as a storage battery is charged with electricity; then the importance of this *mana* led to the conclusion that a spirit inhabited the lance; and finally this spirit was separated from the lance and, having become the prime factor, having become a god, received the lance as a weapon.

Such an interpretation puts a heavy strain on the texts. It is enough to read in its entirety the passage from Arnobius and also the parallel passage from the *Logos Protreptikos* of Clement of Alexandria (4.46) to understand what Varro meant: not that the ancient Romans thought the lance to be Mars, but that it replaced a better representation of Mars. Varro, says Clement, declares that the cultic image of Mars (τοῦ Ἄρεως τὸ ξόανον) was formerly a lance "because the artists

had not yet entered upon the track (dangerous in the opinion of the Christian scholar) which leads to the portrayal of the gods with beautiful faces." It is clearly in the light of this text that we must understand *pro* in the text in which Arnobius lists a number of peoples for whom an object "took the place" of a god: *lignum Icariorum pro Diana, Pessinuntios silicem pro Deum matre, pro Marte Romanos hastam, Varronis ut indicant Musae atque ut Aethlius memorat*; besides Arnobius immediately repeats the reason, which, like Clement, he took from Varro: *ante usum disciplinamque fictorum pluteum Samios pro Junone*—the Samians were satisfied, so long as they had not acquired the custom and the technique of molding clay, with a board "in the guise of" Juno, in place of and instead of Juno.⁸

Some day it will be necessary to restore to the history of religions the idea of the symbol which is today so underrated and yet of such capital importance. Symbolization is the basic resource of every system of thought, every articulate or gestural language. It is what permits one, if not to voice, at least to approximate, to delimit the nature of things, by substituting for the stiff and clumsy copula of identity, "to be," more flexible affinities: "to resemble," "to have as attribute or principal instrument," "to recall by an important association of ideas." Consider the cross in many oratories, the rudimentary crucifix on which the Christ is not shown but which is merely two pieces of wood placed at right angles. If someone from the outside, who does not know of Christianity or wishes to make fun of it, should see this, how would he judge the often burning devotion of which this cross is the object? As a variety of "dendrolatry":⁹ these pieces of wood, it might be said, are holy, they emit *mana*, etc. Of course we well know that it is an entirely different matter: the simplest cross conjures up the passion, the scheme of salvation, from the Incarnation to the Redemption, Adam with the tree of sin and Jesus with the tree of forgiveness. The fervor of the suppliant is not directed to the material object but to the historical realities and to the dogmas which the Gospels and theology associate with the agony of Calvary. The pieces of wood are only an aid, a means of recall, precious and even holy to the

8. Cf. Justin. 43.3.3: *nam et ab origine rerum pro signis immortalibus ueteres hastas coluere, ob cuius religionis memoriam adhuc deorum simulacris hastae adduntur*.

9. I borrow this word from one of the worst descriptions ever made of a religion, based on a purely archaeological dossier: G. Glotz, *La civilisation égéenne* (1923), pp. 263–95.

degree that what it "recalls" is precious and holy. Just as the Samians, before the development of the arts, had a board, *pluteum*, *pro Junone*, so at Sparta the most ancient portrayal of the Dioscuri was two boards, *δόκανα*; despite an opinion which is occasionally voiced, one will not see in this fetish the origin of the divine twins. The wide extent of the cult of the twins, of which the Spartan cult is only a particular case, renders this interpretation very improbable. On the contrary, it will be readily admitted that by understanding them as what they represent everywhere, that is, two young people, two brothers of the human species, an already abstract idea or a still rudimentary technique has expressed the essence of the concept—the fact of the pair—by the juxtaposition of two parallel bars.¹⁰

Why did not the first Romans portray Mars, or indeed the other gods?¹¹ According to Varro, as we have seen, it was only for lack of artistic maturity. It may also be, as among the Germans whom Tacitus described, out of reverence, out of the feeling that any portrayal, and likewise any "putting into the temple," would be an imprisonment. Finally it may be that they did not feel the need for such portrayal. It is not necessary to postulate, as required and reciprocal equivalences, "personality = outline," "anthropomorphism = portrayal." Many peoples conceive of gods in human form, and even know that such a god has such a peculiarity, such a physical monstrosity, a red beard, three eyes, an enormous arm, yet do not show this knowledge in wooden, clay, or stone images. But as it may be useful to indicate distinctively the presence of this invisible being, for sacrifices and in sacred places, without any possible confusion with others, an object is used to identify and characterize it. In Rome this object may be the hearth fire of Vesta, the flint or thunderbolt of Jupiter the Thunderer, or the lance of the warrior Mars. Thus, under attack from all sides, the sentence from the *Life of Romulus*, stating that there was in the Regia a lance "called Mars," slips out of the hands of the champions of the *mana* theory. Do not these words simply allude to the rite in which the commander in chief, *is qui belli suscepit curam*, shook the lance while saying, "*Mars, uigila*"? and is not this injunction addressed to the god beyond the symbol rather than to the

10. See the important study by K. Schlosser, *Der Signalismus in der Kunst der Naturvölker* (1952).

11. There are perhaps reservations to be made concerning the aniconism of the earliest Romans: P. Boyancé, in *REA* 57 (1955): 66-67, with the bibliography.

symbol itself? Confident of being understood, not anticipating H. J. Rose, Plutarch wrote hastily, without troubling himself over style or shades of meaning. He even repeated the verb *προσαγορεύειν* three times within a few lines. Is the second use of this verb—the one on which the predeistic interpretation rests—more than an inadequate approximation? Nothing else in the numerous notes concerning Roman religion collected by this author, who was highly respectful of divinity, is oriented toward predeism, equates a god with a fetish, or suggests that a divine concept had been produced by animating an object. Is this note an exception? Personally I think that Plutarch would be disagreeably surprised if he could see the use which has been made of his cursory remark.

The lance of Mars and, in a parallel case which is liable to a similar refutation, the flints of Jupiter (*Juppiter Lapis*), are the major arguments of the primitivists. Everything else that they have produced has either been improperly interpreted or merely proves something which is readily conceded to them anyhow, that religious acts closely resembling magic existed at Rome side by side with religion.

As for the *interpretatio romana* of the Melanesian *mana* as *numen*, nowadays it seems so inadequate, after so much severe criticism, that its author himself declared it in a late article to be without importance, only the facts having to be taken into account and not the name given to them.¹² He quickly forgot his recantation, however, and until his death dauntlessly used *numen* in the meaning which he had assigned to it. Others continue to do likewise. Although its use seems to have become rarer, otherwise excellent books still refer to *numen* in republican times as a “quality” possessed by a god or even by a thing, sometimes making such references as if by mistake. It is worthwhile to sum up here a very clear dossier which has been available for a long time, since the essentials are contained in T. Birt’s fine article “Zu Vergil Aeneis, I, 8: *quo numine laeso*” (*BPhW* 38 [1918], cols. 212–16), and since F. Pfister, in his monograph in Pauly-Wissowa’s *Real-Encyclopädie* (17 [1937], cols. 1273–91) has contributed the best history of the word, discounting his conclusion, where he quite unexpectedly adopts the *manaist* thesis.

12. “Numen and Mana,” *HTkR*, 1951, pp. 109–30. There is no example that the dominant idea of a religion has not found expression in the language of the adherents of that religion.

The dominant fact is that up to the time of Augustus, and including Cicero, the word *numen* was never used alone but always with the genitive of a divine name (*Jouis, Cereris; dei, deorum*) or, rarely, by analogy, of the name of an entity or of a prestigious collective body (*mentis; senatus, populi Romani*).¹³ In these phrases it does not designate a quality inherent in a god, but the expression of a particular will of this god. Thus it conforms to its etymology. *Numen* is derived from the Indo-European root **neu-*, but it was formed in Latin and not inherited from the Indo-European (Greek *νεῦμα* seems to be a parallel and synonymous, but independent, formation). In Latin, then, whatever may be its meanings in other languages, this root (*adnuere, abnuere*) means exclusively "to make an expressive movement of the head and, by extension, a sign indicating approval or rejection." Varro (*L.L.* 7.85) explains it well as *numen dictum a nutu*, and the beautiful supplication which Livy (7.30.20) ascribes to the Campanian ambassadors to the Roman Senate is more than play on sounds: *adnuite nutum numenque uestrum Campanis et iubete sperare incolumem Capuam futuram*. Wagenvoort's attempt to give to *numen* the general meaning of "movement," based on the meaning, in any case inaccurate, which he attributes to the Vedic root *nav-*, was thus doomed in advance. It is not saved by Lucretius (3.144: *cetera pars animae . . . ad numen mentis momenque mouetur*). Here *numen* and *momen* are not redundant; one designates the decision manifested by the sovereign *mens* and the other the movement in which it is engaged (one might translate, "the rest of the soul obeys the decisions of the intelligence and follows its movements"). It is only with the Augustan writers, through the intermediary of a meaning "divine power," which is, mathematically speaking, as it were the integral of the god's particular wishes, that *numen* becomes first a poetic synonym for "god," second the notation for each of the various *prouvinciae* which form the complex domain of a god, and third the expression of that which is most mysterious in the unseen world. For an understanding of the religion of the royal and republican periods, these developments are without importance. Still it must be noted that Virgil often respects the original meaning; for example, in the verses at the

13. The manalists sometimes offer as evidence a fragment of Lucilius (in Nonius p. 35 L.) but *numen* there is an emendation of *nomen* in the manuscripts, which is, however, acceptable; last of all see Latte, p. 57, n. 2, and cf. H. Wagenvoort himself, *Roman Dynamism*, p. 74, n. 1, in chap. 3, "Numen."

beginning of the *Aeneid* (1.8-11), which are the point of departure for Birt's study:

*Musa mihi causas memora, quo numine laeso
quidue dolens regina deum tot uoluere casus
insignem pietate uirum tot adire labores
impulerit. Tantaene animis caelestibus irae?*

Here *numine laeso* can mean only "which decision manifested by Juno having been violated" (cf. *numen uiolare* in Lucr. 2.614; *temerata uoluntas* in Ov. Met. 9.267). Likewise, in the seventh book (383-84), when the Latins decide on war against the Trojans, the poet specifies that they do so *contra omina, contra fata deum, peruerso numine*, that is, against the signs which were sent to them, against the declarations of the gods, and acting in direct opposition to the decision expressed by those gods (cf. Cic. Mur. 36, *peruersa sententia*).

To sum up, *numen* is unfit to fill the role to which H. J. Rose has assigned it. Ancient usage and etymology on the contrary attest the primacy of the concept of the personal god. Throughout the centuries *numen* was only *numen dei*, the will expressed by such and such a god.

We must insist here on a simple fact, one which the primitivist schools, and the predeistic one in particular, have almost succeeded in having us forget: there is a Latin word *deus*, and it is no small thing. Once more we must acknowledge the existence of Indo-European. The word is found in the majority of Indo-European languages. Among Indo-Iranian tongues, Vedic has *devá* "god," and if in Avestan, as the result of a profound religious reform, *daēva* has become the name of the demons hostile to the gods (but still personal demons), it has recently been proved that among the Scythians **daiva* was still the name of the gods.¹⁴ The Gauls said *devo-*, the Irish *día*, the Britons *de*. In Old Norse, the plural *tívar* was one of the generic names of the gods, along with a singular (especially in composition) *-týr*. Old Prussian had *deiwas*, and the Lithuanian says *diēwas*. In Italy we know Oscan *deivai* "diuae,"¹⁵ and, very recently, Venetic *zeivos*¹⁶ (in an

14. "A propos de quelques représentations folkloriques des Ossètes, 2. **daiva* en ossète," *Paideuma* 7 (Festgabe H. Lommel) (1960): 47-48.

15. In Umbrian *deueia* "divinam" (with the force of "deorum").

16. Hittite has *šyuš* (gen. *šyunaš*) "god," which H. Pedersen has explained by **dyeu-* (see below, p. 177, n. 1): J. Friedrich, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch* (1952), pp. 194-95; cf. *šiwatt-* "day," Luwian *Tiwat*, Palaic *Tiyaz* "Sonne(ngott)" (**dyeu + att-*). The corresponding word in Lydian has recently been identified, R. Gusmani, *Lydisches Wörterbuch* (1964), p. 92: *civ-*, whence *ciovali* "godlike."

inscription at the museum of Vicenza, studied by Michel Lejeune). The important fact is that wherever one can specify the meaning **deiwo* designates an individual being, personal and fully constituted, which is what it designates in Latin (*deus*; plural *diui*, normally reduced to *di*, *dī*, from which *diuus* has been reconstructed; the accusative plural *deiuos* occurs in the so-called "Duenos inscription"). The preservation of this term is enough to destroy the predeistic construction, since it proves that not only the earliest Romans but also their Indo-European ancestors were already in possession of the type of divinity which some persons are attempting to derive, under our very eyes, from a concept equivalent to *mana*, that is, from a distorted interpretation of this *numen*. Are we to admit that the ancient Romans, having originally possessed this word with the meaning of "personal god," kept it apart without using it, during a phase of reaction toward the *mana*, only to restore it later, with its ancient meaning, when their new thoughts about *numen-mana* had given them back the concept of personal gods? It is enough merely to state this evolutionary scheme to realize its absurdity. Better to admit the fact without torturing it: the Indo-Europeans who became the Romans preserved without a break, without a slump, the conception which had been already formed before their migrations and which is indicated everywhere, and has been since the dawn of history, by the phonetic developments of **deiwo*s.

4

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ROMAN GODS

The other arguments of the primitivists are not pertinent to the pre-history of any particular god, nor to the use of a technical word. They are concerned with the general characteristics of the Roman gods, including the most eminent ones, but particularly with the horde of lesser divinities. Although less precise, these arguments are more attractive, because the facts which they present are not arguable. They offer a useful characterization of Roman religion as compared with, for example, the Greek religions. They must, however, be interpreted correctly.

Roughly, what does one find in the Roman world of the gods if one removes everything that it owes to the Greeks? First, a certain number of gods with relatively fixed outlines, separately honored but without kinship and unmarried, without adventures or scandals, without connections of friendship or hostility, in short, without mythology; some, a very few, palpably the most important, are frequently present in religious life; the rest are distributed throughout the months of the calendar and the precincts of the city, made real once a year by a sacrifice, but often without anyone's knowing (as with the gods of July) what services they can render. Around them, in the space and time of Rome, a limitless number of points or moments proved in the past and go on proving their hidden power. The Romans sense the presence on all sides of secret beings, jealous of their secret, constantly on the watch, favoring or upsetting the Romans' undertakings, irritable or obliging, whom they themselves do not know how to name. Finally one glimpses a number of little groups, little teams, strictly interdependent, each member of which is scarcely more than the name he bears—an instrumental name

which imprisons him in the minor definition of a function, in an act or a fraction of an act. In fact, these creatures scarcely appear in literature, but the antiquaries, notably Varro, compiled lists of them which were eagerly seized by the Christian polemicists. These three categories of beings are not even as distinct as the foregoing remarks suggest. Some of the gods of the first group do not have any personality other than their name, which is often a collective name, or any mode of existence other than the brief worship which is rendered to them. Thus by interpenetration they give to the Roman pantheon the appearance of a world of almost motionless shades, of a crepuscular mass from which a few still pallid divinities have succeeded in detaching themselves, while all the others, aborted or stunted in growth, are restricted forever to wretched and scanty manifestations.

We cannot escape this singular impression. Accustomed as we are to the opulent mythologies of Greece and India, of many so-called barbaric peoples, we find it hard to imagine that Roman theology separates at this point from fable, and that the pious souls of Rome are satisfied with these barren nomenclatures that say nothing to the senses and little to the spirit. There must be a basic failing here. One is tempted to admit that Roman society, which very early showed such genius in law and politics, was stricken with an almost total inability, in the area of religion, to create, to conceive, to explore, to organize.

Such a deduction would be paradoxical as well as fatal for further study. Before resigning oneself to it, one should proceed beyond the impression and examine one by one the factors which contribute to it. Why in fact did these otherwise normal and even highly gifted people satisfy their religious needs in these austere forms rather than in the rich and brilliant forms of which they were certainly as capable as others—as their later history proves? We shall take up, in reverse order, the three elements of the divine beings, starting with the minor *Sondergötter* who afforded Saint Augustine so much fun.¹

Certain groups of these beings have remained famous, for example those who govern the birth, the nourishment, and the course of

1. H. Lindemann, *Die Sondergötter in der Apologetik der Civitas Dei Augustini*, Diss. Munich (1930).

study of the child (*Ciu. D.* 4.11 and 7.3.1). After *Vitumnus* and *Sentinus* have given him life and feeling, *Opis* takes him up from the bosom of the earth, *Vaticanus* opens his mouth for the first wails, *Levana* lifts him off the ground, *Cunina* cares for him in the cradle, *Potina* and *Educa* give him drink and food respectively, and *Paventinus* attends to his fears; when he goes to and returns from school, *Abeona* and *Adeona* take charge of him under the supervision of *Juno Iterduca* and *Domiduca*.

Consider further those beings which from hour to hour, even from minute to minute, work in shifts and with growing indiscretion to facilitate the tragicomedy of the wedding night. *Domiducus* has already led the young bride to her husband's home, *Domitius* has installed her there, and *Manturna* has held her back until the most delicate moment, which is described as follows (*ibid.* 6.9.3):

... If the man had to be helped at all costs while working at the task before him, wouldn't some one god or goddess be enough? Would *Venus* alone be unequal to the occasion? She is said to derive her name *Venus* from the fact that without violence a woman does not cease to be a virgin. If there is any modesty among men, though there be none among the gods, when a bridal pair believe that so many gods of both sexes are present and intent on the operation, are they not so affected with shame that he will lose his ardour and she increase her resistance? And surely if the goddess *Virginensis* is there to undo the virgin's girdle, the god *Subigus* to subject her to her husband, the goddess *Prema* to keep her down when subjected so that she will not stir, then what job does the goddess *Pertunda* have here? Let her blush and go outside, let the husband also have something to do! It is surely disgraceful for any but a husband to do the act that is her name. But perhaps she is tolerated because she is called goddess, not god; for if she were supposed to be masculine and so called *Pertundus*, the husband to defend his wife's chastity would require more help against him than the new mother against *Silvanus*.

But Saint Augustine derived his information from serious authors who did not dream of joking. The most remarkable list, with a variant of which he was also aware (4.8), comes from the *Libri iuris pontificii* of *Fabius Pictor*, through *Varro*, who is himself cited by the commentator on *Virgil* (*Serv. Georg.* 1.21). This is the list of specialized entities whose names the *flamen* of *Ceres* recites when he sacrifices to that goddess and to *Tellus* (*quos inuocat flamen sacrum ceriale*

faciens Telluri et Cereri).² Each of these instrumental names ending in -tor corresponds to a specific agricultural activity: *Vervactor* (for the turning over of fallow land), *Reparator* or *Redarator* (for the preparation of the fallow land), *Imporcitor* (for plowing with wide furrows), *Insitor* (for sowing), *Obarator* (for surface plowing), *Occator* (for harrowing), *Sarritor* (for weeding), *Subruncinator* (for thinning out), *Messor* (for harvesting), *Conuector* (for carting), *Conditor* (for storing), and *Promitor* (for distribution). In a neighboring sphere, when the *Fratres Arvales* perform certain expiatory rites for the trees which they remove from the *lucus* of *Dea Dia*, they break up the movement and address themselves separately, as we know from their own *Acta*, to *Adolenda*, *Commolenda*, and *Deferunda* (in A.D. 183), to *Adolenda* and *Coinquenda* (in 224); these four entities, restored from alphabetical order to the natural order of their interventions, had as their provinces the removal of the tree, parcelling it out, cutting it up, and burning it.³

In these classic examples the primitivists see the earliest form of the divine representations of the Romans. According to them, the best-characterized gods emerged from groups of this type into a somewhat wider or more important sphere of activity, or by a process of imitating Greek models. This theory is completely mistaken. On one hand, the specialist entities, who always appear as a team, and on the other hand, the autonomous divinities, form two irreducible categories, answering to different needs. It is not possible to produce a single example, in the historical era during which these lists are numerous, of the kind of promotion by which a divinity on the level of *Vervactor* or *Pertunda* became a divinity such as *Ceres* or *Juno*. Nothing allows us to think that it was otherwise in prehistory. The catalogs of *indigitamenta*—the name of these litanies—are not breeding places for the gods, and the entities gathered together in these catalogs remain there.

2. On this series, see J. Bayet, "Les Ferae Sementivae et les indigitations dans le culte de Cérès et de Tellus," *RHR* 137 (1950): 172-206, esp. p. 180.

3. See references and commentary in Latte, p. 54, who rightly points out that neither the names nor the rites can be ancient. But if there was an archaic model for the names, we are not obliged, as Wagenvoort and Latte believe, to translate "[the tree] which must be removed [cut up, etc.]." These names of pseudo-divinities were fabricated with great freedom, and *Deferunda* may simply be, with an animate feminine ending, the neuter impersonal *deferundum* "it is necessary to remove." Moreover, if one insists on attributing these words to the archaic language, one should not forget that even in Latin the formations in -n-d- had a very wide meaning, not necessarily passive, E. Benveniste, *Origines de la formation des noms en indo-européen* I (1935): 135-43.

A few remarks must be made concerning these groups. First, the conceptual zone in which one finds them is limited. The known *indigitamenta* are related only to rural operations and to private life. The activity of war, for example, in which one might easily imagine a great proliferation of functions relating to the handling of weapons or to field maneuvers, does not contain any such. Whereas the flamen of Ceres calls on Vervactor and his companions, his colleague, the flamen of Jupiter, whose religious activity is constant and about whom we know a great deal, does not have to manage any such teams.

Second, these entities certainly do not have any great importance, even in the limited areas where they are active. Vervactor and his companions seem not to have had any activity, and hence no existence, outside of the flamen's prayer. Cato, to whom we owe our knowledge of so many rural rites, does not mention them, nor does any author, not even the poet of the *Georgics*, or the author of the *Fasti*, nurtured on Varronian scholarship, or the Cicero of the theological treatises. Varro himself, who collected them in his religious books, does not have occasion to speak of them in his book on agriculture. Long before they amused Saint Augustine, the entities of the wedding night might have provided the comic and satiric poets with good effects; Plautus and Juvenal ignore them, however, as they ignore every other enumeration of this sort. Everything takes place as if these roll calls had remained the province of a few specialists in sacrifice, having no more influence on the religion of other Romans than the angelic hierarchy has on the devotion of the average Catholic, which the different Prefaces of the Mass give in several variant forms: *Angeli atque Archangeli, Cherubim quoque ac Seraphim*; or, *cum Angelis et Archangelis, cum Thronis et Dominationibus, cumque omni militia coelestis exercitus*; or, *per quem maiestatem tuam laudant Angeli, adorant Dominationes, tremunt Potestates, Caeli caelorumque Virtutes ac beata Seraphim socia exsultatione concelebrant*. The principle of classification is entirely different in the *indigitamenta* and in the Prefaces, but in both cases the enumeration remains the concern of the liturgists and the theologians; it does not pertain to the living religion.

In the third place, it is possible that these lists were modeled on certain earlier ones, which were perhaps different from those which we now have. It is notable that what we know of the old song of the *Fratres Arvales*, the priests who are concerned with the fields, does

not mention the team of Vervactor but only the great gods who defend or house the grain, or "work" it from inside: Mars, the Lares, and the Semones.

Finally, the best-known lists of *indigitamenta* always appear in a subordinate position. Not only are the entities which figure there never the objects of a cult, the special titulars of a priest, but it is the flamen of Ceres who invokes Vervactor and his companions, when he sacrifices to Ceres and Tellus. What can we say but that they belong to Ceres, that they perform minor details and act subordinate roles in the whole sphere of her work, which is to further the prosperity of the fields? Similarly, among the entities concerned with the child, according to a formal statement by Saint Augustine (Ciu. D. 7.3.1) Abeona and Adeona, *dae ignobilissimae*, are associated in their duties with Juno, the "select queen of the gods, the sister and wife of Jupiter." What we know of Juno, the protectress of marriages and of childbirth, suggests that it is from her that the series *Virginensis*, *Subigus*, etc., and the series *Opis*, *Vaticanus*, etc., derive their functions.

These few remarks suggest a reasonable coexistence of the gods, properly so called, and the lists of *indigitamenta*. The minor entities grouped in one of these lists are as it were the *familia* of a "great" god. I can only repeat what I proposed on this subject sixteen years ago.⁴

At Rome as elsewhere, in order to understand the society of the gods, we must not lose sight of the society of men. What do the private life and the public life of the Romans teach us here?

In private life, let us think of those great *gentes* who have slaves by the thousands, *familia rustica*, *familia urbana*, the majority of whom have specialized duties, as the *pistor*, the *obsonator*, etc. Let us think of the comic enumerations like that in the *Miles Gloriosus* (693-98), where a husband complains of the demands made by his wife during the Roman festival of *Quinquatrus* (*Da quod dem quinquatrubus!*): she has to give money to all the different kinds of witches, *praecantatrici*, *coniectrici*, *hariolae*, *haruspicae*, *piatrici*, as well as to her specialized servants, the *ceraria*, the *obstetrix*, the *nutrix* of the *uernae*—and the Roman spectators were amused by this picturesque "roll call," as they were by the catalog in the *Aulularia*, where it is no longer the *famuli* who are listed in eleven lines, but the artisans, gathered in the service and at the whim of the great ladies (508-22): *stat fullo*, *phrygio*, *aurifex*, *lanarius*, *caupones*, *patagiarii*, *indusiarii*, *flammarii*, *uiolarii*, *cararii*, *propolae*, *linteones*, *calceolarii*, etc.

4. *DIE*, pp. 122-25. I am grateful to Les Presses Universitaires de France for authorization to reproduce this extract and the one on pp. 45-46.

As for the public life of Rome, let us think of all the *apparitores*, the *lictor*, the *praeco*, the *scriba*, the *pullarius*, who accompany the high magistrate, each with his particular competence; and of the priest's *calator*, the candidate's *nomenclator*, etc.

In such a society, which loved lists, specifications, method, and well-divided work, it was natural that the true gods, great and small, should also have within their *prouincia* auxiliaries named for the single act which each had to perform, under the responsibility and for the advantage of the god. Once the mold was established and the habit formed, this kind of personage multiplied in every area, with popular names, sometimes with names just as "poorly made" or with an etymology as approximative as certain products put out nowadays by our drug manufacturers.

We are not speaking here of a "primitive," or even of an inferior form of religion. It is on a second plane, indefinitely peopled, joined to the first. So much the more, I repeat, these entities are not candidates for the rank of "great gods." The *pater familias* cannot be the "transformation" of the *pistor* or of any other *-tor* specialist living in his house or on his farm. The consul cannot emerge from the level of his followers. On the contrary, it is the miller-slave, the provisions-slave, the wheelwright-slave, etc., who require the existence of the *pater familias* and depend on him; and it is the *lictor*, the *quaestor*, etc., who imply the province, the will, and the person of the consul. Similarly Ceres is not a chance variety of Vervactor, Reparator, etc., who has emerged from the mass; quite on the contrary, it is these minor personages who imply the preexistence, on a level above theirs, and with the widest competence and resources, of Ceres.

And are we to be astonished that the Romans knew nothing particular or personal about Vervactor, for example, outside of his one act? We might just as well be astonished that we know nothing, not even his name, of the *lictor* to whom Brutus turned over his sons, or of the *lictors* to whom Manlius or the cruel conquerors of Capua said, anonymously, "I, *lictor*, *deliga ad palum*!" In the eyes of the citizen this functionary presents, in political life, exactly the same very limited angle of interest as Vervactor and his companions in the cult of Ceres. Let us not conclude that the Romans were incapable of going beyond a schematic type of divine person. Let us rather conclude, as we replace things in their natural historical order and rely on the ordinary parallelism between the invisible and the visible, that they were sparing of exact specifications, and that their imagination, while it multiplied the specialized auxiliaries of the gods in imitation of their social life, did not waste its time in conceiving and saying more about them than was necessary.⁵

5. As things are, we must not expect clarification from the etymology of the words *novensiles* and *indigetes*. E. Vetter, "Di Novensides, di Indigetes," *IF* 62 (1956): 1-32, is not convincing.

The primitivists advance other kinds of facts which seem to them to show how hard it was for the Romans to imagine a god, to do more than sense his presence, or to liberate him from the physical phenomena in which he manifested himself.

First there is the frequent uncertainty concerning the sex of the divinities. This the Romans accepted, and it did not seem to disturb them. Liturgical formulas, preserved by the historians and imitated by the poets, used the phrase *siue deus siue dea*. According to a note by Servius (*Aen.* 2.451), a buckler was preserved at the Capitol, bearing the inscription *Genio Romae, siue mas siue femina*. Furthermore, the Romans did not even know whether the really ancient divinity named Pales, who was important both in the rural economy and in national history, was a god or a goddess, and opinions on this subject were divided.

An even greater uncertainty is revealed with regard to a number of local or temporal entities.⁶ When a Roman said *genius loci*, he said everything he could about the kind of supernatural being which revealed itself indirectly, by a single phenomenon, and in a fixed place; and he was resigned to this paucity of information. The specifications of the concept of *Fortuna* seem to be particularly convincing. *Fortuna huius diei* (*Cic. Leg.* 2.28), to whom a temple was vowed during the battle of Vercelli in which the Cimbri were defeated, is analogous in her inconsistency to *Fortuna uirilis*, *Fortuna muliebris*, and many others, whose sanctuaries are found throughout Rome. Is not the limit of Roman creativity in the matter of gods, the incapacity of the Romans to flesh out and materialize a being that they do not see, conveyed in this expression which claims to be adequate?

There is the same lesson, we are told, in the designations of gods such as *Aius Locutius*: once a voice spoke to the Romans, with predictions of dire events in the near future. In this voice, to be sure, they recognized an ally from the beyond, but all they could manage to conceive of it was expressed in a double name derived from two verbs meaning "to say"; they knew that it had spoken, and that was all. What would not the fertile imagination of the Greeks or the Indians have invented under similar circumstances!

These facts are true on the whole, but perhaps they are presented

6. K. Latte, "Über eine Eigentümlichkeit der italischen Gottesvorstellung," *ARW* 24 (1902): 244-58.

somewhat tendentiously, and above all they find a much better explanation outside of primitivism. The picture presented here is not one of complete impotence. The Roman was certainly able to determine the sex of a divinity, and, like the Greek or the Indian, he could make up stories. If he does not do so, it is by virtue of a character, a quality of spirit which is not peculiar to him, to be sure, but which he has developed to an astonishing degree—prudence. His magistrates, who are all professional jurists, know the importance of formulas and the necessity of not exceeding by one syllable the inventory of known facts in the relations between gods and men as well as those between man and man. Others have used words to produce lyric poetry, have dreamed, have amplified; the Roman, on the other hand, for many years used his language to compose exact and useful statements, and the elegance of this literary genre is not that of poetry.

Throughout this book we shall find this juridical spirit pervading the worship and the whole fabric of religious life with its reservations and its precisions; it occurs in a great variety of forms, many of which are specific illustrations of prudence. In legal chicanery, in procedure, in the efforts of the lawyer as well as in the wording of claims, one must be *cautus*. The very word for a lawsuit and its contents, *causa*, is doubtless derived from this root, and the magistrate who had to condemn men to death said simply, "*male cauerunt*." The word which finally designated the whole of man's relationship with the invisible, *religiones*, *religio*, whatever its etymology, originally expressed caution: not a flight of the spirit, or any form of activity, but a halt, the uncertain hesitation in the face of a manifestation which one must first understand fully before one adjusts to it. The Romans thus very quickly measured the force and efficacy of words in the field of religion. One of the first "myths" that one reads in the vulgate of the beginnings tells of a bargain between Jupiter and Numa, which is at the same time a test whereby the god makes sure that the king understands the importance of vocabulary and syntax. The god expresses himself poorly, giving his opponent an opening. "Cut off a head!" he says. Numa replies, interrupting him with the words "... an onion." "A man's," the god rejoins, without specifying precisely that he wants the human head which he first mentioned. Numa seizes his second chance, and again interrupts with "his hair." The god repeats his mistake once more, and demands "a

life"; "of a fish," interposes Numa. Jupiter is convinced; he rewards and as it were confers a diploma on this brilliant student. "See to it," he says, "that by these things thou dost expiate my bolts, O man whom none may keep from converse with me [*o uir conloquio non abigende meo*]"⁷ (Ov. F. 3.339-44).

Such is the constant care of the Roman in his religious as well as his social life: to speak without imprudence, to say nothing and above all to use no formula by which the god or his human spokesman might benefit at his expense, nothing which might irritate the god, or which might be misconstrued or misunderstood. No less legendary than the colloquy of Jupiter and Numa but no less revealing is the famous account of the events which guaranteed to Rome the privilege of the Capitoline omen. While excavating to establish the foundations of the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, the diggers brought to light a man's head. The Romans sent emissaries to Etruria to consult a famous soothsayer on the meaning they should give to this discovery. They did not suspect the risk they were running. By a clever play on the two adverbs of place *illic* and *hic*, "over there" and "here," the Etruscan would surely have dispossessed and robbed them of the omen and of its meaning, if, by a providential betrayal, his own son had not warned his guests (Dion. 4.60):

I hear me, Romans. My father will interpret this prodigy to you and will tell you no untruth, since it is not right for a soothsayer to speak falsely; but, in order that you may be guilty of no error or falsehood in what you say or in the answers you give to his questions (for it is of importance to you to know these things beforehand), be instructed by me. After you have related the prodigy to him he will tell you that he does not fully understand what you say and will circumscribe with his staff some piece of ground or other; then he will say to you: "This is the Tarpeian Hill, and this is the part of it that faces the east, this the part that faces the west, this point is north and the opposite is south." These parts he will point out to you with his staff and then ask you in which of these parts the head was found. What answer, therefore, do I advise you to make? Do not admit that the prodigy was found in any of these places he shall inquire about when he points them out with his staff, but say that it appeared among you at Rome on the Tarpeian Hill. If you stick to these answers and do not allow yourselves to be misled by him, he, well knowing that fate cannot be changed, will interpret to you without concealment what the prodigy means.

7. Var. *deum* for *meo*.

And what a meaning! The soothsayer is finally obliged to reveal it: the place where the head was found will be the head of Italy.

The formulas of the fetial priests at the conclusion of a treaty, as Livy has transmitted them (1.24.7-8), bear witness to the same concern for precision. Before he sacrifices the pig to Jupiter, the guarantor of treaties, the priest declares that the Roman people will not be the first to violate the clauses *uti ea hic hodie rectissime intellecta sunt*, and that if they do, Jupiter will be able, on that day, *illo die*, to strike them *sicut ego hunc porcum hic hodie feriam*.

It is in this tradition of verbal prudence that we must interpret limitative specifications like *Fortuna huius diei*, *huius loci*, etc. They are explained by the Romans' concern to circumscribe in space or in time what is expected, hoped for, or feared. Not that the Romans had not for a long time had the concept of *fortuna*. But as a general term it was of no use to them, since they were not greatly concerned with a long-range, universally valid destiny. Therefore they made the idea specific according to its places and times of application. Had such a place or such a day, in their experience, shown itself to be particularly propitious or harmful to Roman undertakings? Then they might reasonably conclude that some variety of *fortuna* would in the future require the particular grateful or precautionary attention of men. For example, the Allia had been the site of a cruel defeat and one heavy with consequences, at the time of the Gallic invasion. Thus, at a later date the Romans hesitated to engage in another battle there—which is what Rome's enemies, the Praenestines, were hoping for. It was not that they feared fortune in general, or the *fortuna* of battle, or that of the consul, or that of the day, but the specific, circumscribed *fortuna* of the place (Liv. 6.28.7 and 29.1).⁸

This attitude is found in all religions in which formulas are used. The poets of the *ṚgVeda*, whose learnedly daring lyricism we may contrast with the matter-of-fact spirit of the Romans, do not escape from it when the occasion demands it. Do they seek the protection of Indra (8.61.16-17)? "Protect us behind, below, above, before, on all sides, O Indra! Ward off from us the danger which comes from the gods, ward off the blows of the non-gods. Protect us, O Indra, every today and every tomorrow; protect us always, day and night!" The caution here expressed consists in a complete summation, not in

8. See the commentary in *DL*, p. 79, n. 3.

a thorough limitation, but the intention and the need are the same: to express oneself in a way that leaves the being whom one is addressing no loophole. The *Atharva Veda* provides a number of similar examples, and one might cite, from the myths of India, Ireland, and elsewhere, more than one misfortune which befell gods or demons because they mispronounced an important word or put the accent in the wrong place, or because they delimited inadequately the "yes" with which they answered a request. But these displays of prudence are particularly evident in Roman worship, perhaps partly because we know only their formulary framework.

It is certainly still prudence which explains the formulas of the type *siue deus siue dea*,⁹ or the even less ambitious designations like *Aius Locutius*.

With regard to the former, we must first clear up a misapprehension. It is not correct to say that the Romans ever agreed not to give a sex to a specific divinity whom they knew in other respects and to whom they had given a name. As we shall see, the example of Pales, which is always cited here, does not hold out against the rigorous test of the facts. Pales, or rather the two Pales, of Rome are both goddesses, and the masculine Pales is found only in Etruria; this means merely that the Etruscan divinity with the same function as Pales was a god, not a goddess. At Rome, however, neither the shepherds nor the scholars were misled by this.¹⁰ When one reads on the buckler at the Capitol *Genio Romae, siue mas siue femina*, the word *siue*, here and in all

9. The opening of the formula of *euocatio* is often cited at this point (Macr. 3.9.7). It is a false interpretation: the context proves that *si deus, si dea est cui populus ciuitasque Carthaginiensis est in tutela* means "all the gods and goddesses who protect the people and the city of Carthage."

10. Below, pp. 380-84. The other "hesitations about sex" that are cited are not that. **Florus* does not exist at Rome beside *Flora*; it is only in Oscan territory that he is found, and even that is not certain (Vetter, p. 183). **Pomo* or **Pomonus* is Umbrian (Tlg. III 26, etc.; cf. A. Ernout, *Aspects du vocabulaire latin* [1954], p. 29, n. 1) and does not coexist in Latin with *Pomona* (the *Pomones*, a lexical term [Gloss. Ansileubi: Gloss. Lat. 1 (1926): 450] defined as "*pomorum custodes*" could only be "small change," in the plural, of *Pomona*, for the various kinds of *poma*; word modeled on *Semones*?). *Tellumo* is not the masculine doublet of *Tellus*, but a name of indigitation in the series *Tellumo Altor Rusor* (Aug. Ciu. D. 2.3.2). *Jana* is more than doubtful. If there ever was a goddess *Caca*, which has not been established, *Cacus* is solely a character in legend. In fact, there is a coupling (and no hesitation!) only of the divinities who govern sexuality (*Liber-Libera*) or are heavily involved in sexuality (*Faunus-Fauna*). Obviously such pairs as *Quirinus* and *Hora Quirini* or of the type of *Mars* and *Cerfus Martius* (Iguvium) do not at all prove that the Romans or the Umbrians had trouble in distinguishing the second divinity from the first.

analogous cases, is intended to prevent confusion and ambiguity. The Romans know that there is, somewhere, a divine being, but they have no further information; and while trying to make clear their meaning so that it cannot possibly be misconstrued, they are unwilling to exceed the limits of their knowledge. The idea of a feminine *Genius* is strange, and for this reason, the information given by Servius is suspect. But the thought process which justifies the phrase is entirely real and Roman. If, for instance, they had said "he," if they had been satisfied with a masculine *Genius*, and it turned out to be "she," then "she" would have had entire freedom to pretend that she ignored the offering of the buckler, or even to take offense. In sum, this is only a particular instance of a very general attitude. In the same passage Servius cites a prayer formula: *et pontifices ita precabantur "Juppiter Optime Maxime, siue quo alio nomine te appellari uolueris . . ."* The pontiffs certainly conceive of Jupiter precisely, and as fully as a Greek conceives of Zeus, and they are aware that his principal epithets are Optimus and Maximus. But they reserve the possibility of incomplete information, of some caprice on the part of the god, of any uncertainty, and they provide for these contingencies in the words which they add to the epithets. The fifth book of the *Aeneid* (94-96) offers a good example of the same circumspection. At the end of the year Aeneas has placed an offering on his father's tomb. A serpent appears, tastes the food, and then goes back into the tomb. Aeneas does not know what this animal is—the genius of the place? a messenger from his father? *incertus Geniumne loci famulumne parentis esse putet*. And so he repeats his offering. Shall we conclude that Aeneas, which is to say every Roman, is incapable of distinguishing the different kinds of spirits? On the contrary, it is because he is familiar with these varieties, and because he does not know which one the serpent represents, since it is multivalent, that he repeats the rite. The uncertainty exists and is felt by the celebrant, but it results from an insufficiency of information; he is aware of this and prudently bases his conduct on it.¹¹ The expression *siue deus siue dea* does not prove that the Roman had difficulty in imagining sexually differentiated gods; it proves merely that in a specific case he does not feel himself to be sufficiently informed and that he prefers to envisage both possibilities.

11. J. Bayet, "Les cendres d'Anchise: dieu, héros ou serpent?" *Gedenkschrift G. Rohde* (1961), pp. 39-56.

The modern businessman who prints up ten thousand copies of an advertising circular beginning "Dear Sir or Madam" operates in the same way.

The case of Aius Locutius can be explained in the same way; it does not reveal a weakness of conception, nor is it an extension of the primitive:

The Romans knew that a god had intervened in a famous occurrence, since he had spoken, and his voice had been heard; they even knew that it was a male god, since it is possible to recognize a person's sex by his voice. But they knew nothing more about their benefactor. To be sure, they might have expressed their certainties and circumvented their lack of information by using an analytic formula, by saying, for example, "the god who spoke." This was too long. They said, "*Aius Locutius*." But the intention and the result are the same. Can it really be disputed that the Romans, if such had been their wish, could have imagined the god who had spoken to them, in human form, complete with features and expression, or that they would have made conjectures regarding his identity with one or another of the known and honored gods? They simply did not want to. Their experience in lawsuits, in this legal art which is essentially precise and cautious, had taught them that it is better not to add imaginary and unverified elements to the proven data of a file, even if the latter are very limited. Artificial speculations open the way to risks, and especially to the risk of misdirection. In the most favorable cases, where the marvelous intervention was somehow identified, they did not hesitate over the god's *nomen*, and merely gave him a new *cognomen* derived from the event. For instance, in all the cases of *uota*, the Romans were sure that the power who had halted the panic on a certain battlefield, or had achieved the victory on another, was Jupiter, since it was to Jupiter that the general had vowed a temple in order to obtain this success. Thus the worship and gratitude of the Romans were naturally addressed to Jupiter, *Stator* or *Victor*. Doubtless in the same way a specific detail, later forgotten and replaced by various mutually incompatible legends, guaranteed that the goddess to whom they owed a certain piece of precious advice was Juno. Therefore they worshiped not some vague "*Nuntia Moneta*" but, with complete assurance, Juno *Moneta*—whom a picturesque and unpredictable future was to make the eponym of our "money." The Romans could just as easily have formed the flattering hypothesis that the god who had spoken in a Roman street on the eve of the Gallic invasion was Jupiter, and called him Jupiter *Locutius*, as they spoke of Jupiter *Elicius*. But this would have been dangerous; it might have irritated Jupiter, if by chance he had had nothing to do with the incident, as well as the god who actually had spoken. Therefore

they merely used a double expression, "*Atus Locutius*," for which there were some precedents. This was not the impotence of savages, but once more, as always, the prudence and verbal caution of a people experienced in legal procedure.¹²

12. *DIE*, pp. 138-39. The same arguments would be made, for example, for the "god" *Rediculus*, who had a *fanum extra portam Capenam*. He owed his name to the fact that Hannibal, after coming very close to Rome, *ex eo loco redierit* (*Fest.*, *Paul.* pp. 384-85 L²). At the time of the Second Punic War the Romans were certainly capable of conceiving of gods with a complete personality; but, not knowing which god had inspired the visions that persuaded Hannibal to retreat (*quibusdam perterritus uisis*), they chose this prudent way out.

5

THE LOST MYTHOLOGY: THE EXAMPLE OF THE *MATRALIA*

There remains the great peculiarity of the Roman gods, this deprivation of all mythology and all kinship, this "inhumanity," and, in many cases, outlines and activities so vague that in the end we know less about them than about Vervactor, Pertunda, or Aius Locutius.

This last point is only too well established: a goddess like Furrina, important enough to be the titular of one of the twelve minor flamens, remains almost as mysterious to us as she was to Cicero, who was able to say something about her only by means of an etymological pun (*furia*). She is not the only one. Here too a few remarks will suffice to remove the argument which the primitivists base on such divinities.

First, the number of these mysteries has been appreciably reduced during the last twenty-five years. Of the list of enigmatic figures which Wissowa drew up, the majority have been given a plausible meaning, in which all the items of the file fall into place harmoniously and which are supported by parallel cases found among other Indo-European peoples. Among the goddesses, not to revert to Pales, whose entire mystery consisted in the uncertainty of her sex, Carna, Diva Angerona together with Volupia, Feronia, and even Lua Mater can now be understood; in their special functions they are peculiar, but as divinities they are normal, even banal.¹ Among the male gods, the classic example of Quirinus is not more tenable; he too can be understood in his own right and in his relations with the two other gods of the major flamens, both in his original form and in his later development. To obtain these results it has been sufficient to refrain from strong

1. See below, pp. 380-84 (Pales), 385-87 (Carna), 335-37 (Angerona), 414-21 (Feronia); for Lua, *DL*, chap. 4.

prejudices, as, for example, in the case of the goddesses, from the barren obsession with the "Mother Goddess" or the "Great Goddess," and, in the case of the god, the Sabine illusion and a few others, about which we shall speak again shortly.

This first comment leads naturally to another. The imprecision, the uncertainty which was thought to be congenital among the divinities, does not in fact exist. To be sure, the Romans of the classical period misunderstood Quirinus, and if they left good definitions of Carna, they had strong doubts about Angerona. Their hesitations over both Quirinus and Angerona have contributed not a little to complicating the file and making its investigation difficult for us moderns. But this annoying situation does not mean that Quirinus and Angerona were poorly formed, incomplete, and at all times uncertain divinities. On the contrary, our uncertainty is the result of a weakening, an aging produced by the forgetting of definitions and functions which had earlier been clear, complex, and harmonious. In the era when it was fixed in literature, a great part of the Roman pantheon was on its way to dissolution. The Greek flood had submerged everything and had destroyed the taste for and awareness of traditional explanations. The most original forms, those which had not been able to receive an *interpretatio graeca*, were destined to disappear or to survive only in rites which became less and less intelligible. In the face of this disaster, it is a wonder that the four or five disparate facts survived which, together, clarify Angerona, or the two mentions which give some meaning to Carna. In the case of Furrina this miracle simply did not occur. In short, none of these divine personalities whose vagueness disconcerted the antiquaries of the dying Republic and of the Empire before they baffled modern exegetes suggests any "primitive" form of religion.

But it is true: not even the most important and most vital gods have any mythology. Take for example the gods of the major flamens, Mars and Jupiter, who, without being confused with each other, work together in the growth of Rome, and Quirinus, who is defined as the opposite of Mars and yet, paradoxically, is sometimes confused with him. These gods do not take part in any adventures, either all three together or any two of them, not even dividing the *prouvinciae* of the world and of the state in a way comparable to what Zeus and his two brothers did after their defeat of the Titans. Outside of the

sacra which are offered to him, the *auspicia* which he sends, and the thunderbolt which he governs, all that the Romans know about the earliest Jupiter amounts only to the promises which he made to Romulus and Numa and the punishment which he inflicted on the imprudent Tullus. Still, in these few cases, the great god's partner is a man and his actions are part of "history." At the end of the Etruscan period, when the three Capitoline gods were united in a single temple with three *cellae*, it is not certain that Juno Regina was Jupiter's "wife," even though an indirect Greek influence was probable about this time. Ops and Consus form a theological and ritual couple, not a married pair.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus expressed the admiring astonishment of his compatriot philosophers at this absence of fables. Convinced that the Romans are Greeks, through the intermediacy of the Albans, he celebrates with complete freedom the wisdom of the earliest institutions and the religious purity of these settlers of the Occident. Romulus, he thinks, copied "the best customs in use among the Greeks," but he knew how to limit his borrowing from them (2. 18-20):

... But he rejected all the traditional myths concerning the gods that contain blasphemies or calumnies against them, looking upon these as wicked, useless and indecent, and unworthy, not only of the gods, but even of good men; and he accustomed people both to think and to speak the best of the gods and to attribute to them no conduct unworthy of their blessed nature.

Indeed, there is no tradition among the Romans either of Ouranos being castrated by his own sons or of Kronos destroying his own offspring to secure himself from their attempts or of Zeus dethroning Kronos and confining his own father in the dungeon of Tartarus, or, indeed, of wars, wounds, or bonds of the gods, or of their servitude among men. . . .

Let no one imagine, however, that I am not sensible that some of the Greek myths are useful to mankind, part of them explaining, as they do, the works of Nature by allegories, others being designed as a consolation for human misfortunes, some freeing the mind of its agitations and terrors and clearing away unsound opinions, and others invented for some other useful purpose. But, though I am as well acquainted as anyone with these matters, nevertheless my attitude toward the myths is one of caution, and I am more inclined to accept the theology of the Romans, when I consider that the advantages from the Greek myths are slight and cannot be of profit to many, but only to those who have examined the end for which they are designed; and this philosophic attitude is shared by few. The great multitude,

unacquainted with philosophy, are prone to take these stories about the gods in the worse sense and to fall into one of two errors: they either despise the gods as buffeted by many misfortunes, or else refrain from none of the most shameful and lawless deeds when they see them attributed to the gods.

We now have direct proof that this bareness, this insensibility of the Roman pantheon, is not in itself primitive. Like all the other Indo-European peoples, the Romans at first loaded their gods with myths and based their cultic scenarios on the behavior or the adventures of the gods.² Then they forgot all that. It sometimes happens, however, that we can discern the myths through the characteristic marks they left on the rites which they originally justified and which, after their disappearance, became insoluble puzzles, even for the Romans of the great era. The myths which we can thus recover are in strict harmony with stories told by the Vedic Indians and, sometimes, by the Scandinavians. I shall give only one example, but in some detail.³ Others will be indicated later in the book.

On 11 June the Romans celebrated the Matralia, the feast of the goddess Mater Matuta.⁴ Despite many discussions, despite prodigies of ingenuity expended to obfuscate what is perfectly clear, Mater Matuta is Dawn. *Matuta* is the name from which the adjective *matutinus* was formed, and in this kind of derivation the adjective never adds anything fundamental to the substantive. To be sure, the name *Matuta* belongs to a large family of words (*manus* "good," *maturus* "ripe," etc.) whose common element is the idea of "being just in time"; but each of these words has followed its own line of development, and *Matuta* came to be the deified name for the "break of the day." It was understood in this way by the ancients (Lucr. 5.650).⁵

2. Despite H. J. Rose, "Myth and Ritual in Classical Civilisation," *Mnem.*, 4th ser., 3 (1950): 281-87, who denies the existence of myths at Rome.

3. What follows sums up chap. 1 of *DL*, completed and corrected—for the second rite—on the basis of useful criticisms (A. Brelich, *J. Brough*) which I regret having originally underestimated. Discussions of earlier exegeses will be found there, notably that of H. J. Rose, based on an extravagant use of *sororiare*, which he connects with the root of the German *schwellen*. One is sorry to find this again in Latte (pp. 97, n. 3, and 133: Juno *Sororia* as goddess of puberty!); see *DL*, pp. 14 (and n. 1)-16, and *Aspekte*, p. 21, n. 6.

4. The Matralia are nothing else but this festival of Mater Matuta, and there is no way of distinguishing them; contrary opinion of A. Ernout, *RPh.* 32 (1958): 151.

5. I sum up here the demonstration in *DL*, pp. 17-19; cf. M. Pokrovskij, "Maturus, Matuta, matutinus, manus (manis), manes, mane," *KZ* 35 (1897): 233-37. Latte (p. 97) pays no attention to this, and prefers to explain Matuta, in which he refuses to see Dawn,

By chance we know two very precise rites of the Matralia, her feast, which is restricted to ladies, *bonae matres* (Ov. *F.* 6.475), who have been married once, *uniuirae* (Tert. *Monog.* 17). Plutarch, confirmed by Ovid for the second (*F.* 6.559, 561) and partially for the first (ibid. 551-58), refers to these rites several times (*Cam.* 5.2; *Q.R.* 16 and 17; for the second rite, *Mor.* 492D = *De frat. am.*, end of 21). These rites are as follows: (1) While the temple of Matuta is normally forbidden to the servile class, the ladies assembled for the feast bring into the enclosure a slave woman, whom they then drive out with slaps and blows; (2) the ladies bear in their arms, "treat with respect," and commend to the goddess not their own children, but those of their sisters. These actions had to follow one another in this very order, as it appears in the two references by Plutarch. The Romans themselves did not comment on them, and they have provoked modern exegetes to many fantastic interpretations. A glance at the Dawn goddess of the Vedic Indians, *Uṣás*, allows us to understand them completely: what the Roman ladies do once a year, at the Matralia, is done every morning by *Uṣas*, or by the Dawns, *Uṣṣasah*, in a collectivity which the poets sometimes mobilize for each particular morning, namely, a negative service of cleaning, and its positive corollary.

1. Dawn "chases the black shapelessness" (*bádhatē kṣṇám ábhvam*: *RV* 1.92.5), "drives back the hostility, the shadows" (*apa dvéṣo bádhamānā támāṃsi*: 5.80.5), "drives back the shadow [*ápa bádhatē tīmah*]" as a heroic archer chases his enemies" (6.64.3); the Dawns "hold off and pursue the shadow of night [*vī tá bádhante táma ūrmyā-yath*]" while directing the head of the high sacrifice" (6.65.2); "Dawn the goddess marches, driving back [*bádhamānā*] by her light all the shadows, the dangers; here the brilliant Dawns have shown themselves; . . . the shadow has gone to the west, the displeasing one"

by the Oscan *Maatúis Kerriúis* (dative) in the ritual of the Table of Agnone (Vetter, no. 111, line 10). These, being "Cereal," should rather be compared with *maturus*. Is it not more sensible to listen to Lucretius:

*Tempore item certo roseam Matuta per oras
aetheris auroram refert et lumina pandit . . .*

There is at Rome no ancient religious reference to the Dawn other than as Mater Matuta and her festival. It is possible, however, that she remained alive in folklore. She had her revenge later. R. Rebuffat, "Les divinités du jour naissant sur la cuirasse d'Auguste de Porta Porta," *MEFR* 73 (1961): 161-228; "Images pompéiennes de la Nuit et de L'Aurore," *MEFR* 76 (1964): 91-104; "La relève des bergers chez les Lestrygons," *MEFR* 77 (1965): 109-48.

(*apācīnaṃ tāmo agād djuṣṭam*) (7.78.2 and 3). The hymns thus portray the natural phenomenon of the coming of day as the violent driving back of the shadows, of "the shadow," identified with the enemy, barbarous, demoniac, "shapeless," dangerous, etc., by Dawn or the band of Dawns—noble goddesses, "women of the arya," *aryāpatniḥ* (7.6.5),⁶ *supātniḥ* (6.44.23). This is what the *bonae matres*, the *uniuirae* ladies, also act out in the Matralia, against a slave woman who must represent, in contrast with themselves, the wicked and base-born element.

2. In this world freed from shadows, Dawn or the Dawns bring in the Sun. This simple truth receives many expressions in the Vedic hymns, but one of them, a singular one which the phenomenon itself does not suggest, is probably the result of reflection by the priests. Dawn is the sister-goddess par excellence. In the *ṚgVeda* the word *svāsṛ* "sister" is applied only thirteen times to a divinity; in eleven cases it refers to Uṣas or to a divinity called a sister of Uṣas; and it is with Night, Rātrī, a divinity of the same type, that she forms the most constant "sisterly couple." In the eleven texts just cited, six concern Uṣas as sister of Rātrī, or vice versa; there are five examples, in the dual, of "the two sisters," three times designating Uṣas and Rātrī, and twice Heaven and Earth. And this is not merely an elegant figure of speech; the expression is a good definition of the relations between these two persons. To the same extent that Dawn acts violently against the demoniac Shades, she is respectful and devoted toward Night, who, like herself, belongs to the grand scheme of the world, this *ṛtā* or cosmic order, of which they are conjointly called "the mothers" (1.142.7; 5.5.6; 9.102.7). But it is another child of these collaborating mothers who gives rise to the most characteristic expressions: either, by a peculiar physiological process, they are the two mothers of the Sun, or of Fire, sacrificial or otherwise, "their common calf" (1.146.3; cf. 1.95.1; 96.5); or, Dawn receives the son, the Sun or Fire, from her sister Night, and cares for him in her turn.⁷

6. Despite the accent, this is the most probable meaning of this word, which is applied in the *RV* once to the Dawns and once to the Waters.

7. The importance and even the authenticity of this mythical representation of the Sun's two mothers have been thoughtlessly contested by J. Brough. It receives a striking confirmation in the Wikanderian exegesis of the *Mahābhārata*. The chief heroes of this poem are presented as the sons of the chief gods; in character and behavior they reproduce the essential characteristics of their fathers. Thus Karna, the son of the Sun god, duplicates three mythic traits of the Vedic Sun: (1) His hostile relations with the hero Arjuna, the son

This second form of expression is especially useful here, as is shown by the following illustration (3.55.11-14):

11. The twin sisters [*yamīā*] have put on different colors, of which one shines while the other is black. The dark and the red are two sisters [*svāsārau*] . . .

13. Licking the other's calf, she bellowed [*anyāsya vatsām rihatī mimāya*] . . .

14. The multiform one dresses herself in beautiful colors, she holds herself upright, licking a year-and-a-half-old calf.

Throughout these variants the governing idea is constant: Dawn suckles (1.95.1 and 96.5) or licks (3.55.13) the child who either belongs to herself and her sister Night in common, or to that sister alone. Thanks to this care, this child, the Sun (or in the liturgical speculations, the Fire of the offerings, and all Fire), which has emerged from the womb of Night, arrives at the maturity of day. These mythic expressions, which articulate the ideas of "mothers," of "sister," of "the sister's child," well express the function of the brief dawn: the appearance of a sun or a fire, which was already fully formed before she intervened. Like the first, the second rite of the Matralia is completely clarified by this confrontation with Indian ideology. The Romans, a realistic people, simply cannot envisage any physiological prodigy. The child does not have two mothers but, as in the variant which the Indians did not prefer, a mother and an aunt. The Sun, son of the Night, is taken in charge by her sister, the Dawn.⁸

Finally it should be remarked that of all the divine figures of the *R̥g Veda* Uṣās has the most highly developed kinship.⁹ Sister of Night, mother and aunt of the Sun (or of Fire), she is also in other contexts the wife or lover of the Sun (or of Fire), and of him alone (for she is not a courtesan), daughter of Heaven, and mother in general, both of men (7.81.4) and of the gods (1.113.19). Thus the matrons who act out in the Matralia the two aspects of "Mater" Matuta's function

of Indra, are those of the Sun and Indra. (2) Arjuna overthrows him when a wheel of his chariot sinks into the earth, just as Indra detaches a wheel from the chariot of the Sun. (3) Like the Sun, he has two successive mothers, his natural mother who abandons him on the very night of his birth, and his adoptive mother whom he later acknowledges as his true mother; see ME 1: 126-35.

⁸ Is it necessary to emphasize that this representation of Dawn does not presuppose the existence at Rome of a parallel Night goddess? The Vedic Night goddess, the sister of Dawn, hardly exists outside the myths of the latter.

⁹ L. Renou, *Etudes védiques et pāṇinéennes*, 3, pt. 1, *Les hymnes à l'Aurore du R̥g Veda* (1957): 8-9; the entire brief but substantial introduction (pp. 1-12) should be read.

and who must therefore not only act like but "be" like her, are at the same time sisters, mothers, and aunts, and fulfill a further condition with respect to their husbands by being *uniuirae*. No other Roman ritual carries the cumulative demands for so many familial relationships.

The information provided by this comparison has far-reaching consequences. The two actions of the *bonae matres* and the familial conditions which they had to fulfill have not been explained to us by the Romans themselves, and Plutarch, who tried to find Hellenizing justifications for them, was not aware of this ancient meaning. Perhaps it had been totally lost. And yet, behind the actions, at Rome as in India, there must have been in primitive times ideas, a nuanced and complex portrayal, negative and positive, rational but also dramatic, of the phenomenon of dawn, or rather of Dawn, the Dawns, conceived as divine persons. Because, and we must insist on this point, neither of the two Roman rites is directly inspired by the phenomenon or acts it out objectively; both substitute an anthropomorphic interpretation of it, with connections of kinship—a noble sister-goddess of the night hostilely driving out her opposite who has the marks of a slave woman, then affectionately fondling her nephew the Sun; there is also, as in India, a multiplication of this divine person in the group of "Dawns," acting as a team. Thus there formerly existed a Roman mythology of the dawn in the common Greek or Vedic sense of the word, and we can read its essential features as they are preserved in the ritual.

If the first of the two representations thus revealed—the Dawn ladies driving out the wicked Shade—may have been formed independently in India and in Rome, the second—the Dawn ladies fondling their sister's son—is original and even unexpected. I know no example of it outside of India and Rome; it is thus *a priori* probable that the mythology of the dawn was inherited, in these two societies, from their common past.¹⁰

Finally this mythology is on an advanced level. It assumes an analysis less of the phases than of the effects of the dawn phenomenon, and a subtle distinction between the wicked shade driven out by the Dawns and the fecund Night whose fruit they gather. Here the earliest Romans are restored to their proper intellectual dignity, to the

10. On the annual date of the festival of Mater Matuta, see below, pp. 337–39.

level of the Vedic bards, not, to be sure, for the poetic expression but for the conception. We are far from the stammerings, the impotencies, and even from the "electrodynamic land of enchantment" to which the primitivists reduce them.¹¹

At what stage did Rome lose its mythology? One can only guess. Personally I would not put the beginning of this process very far back. In any case, it was certainly hastened and completed by the invasion of Greek mythology, which was much richer and much more prestigious. The fate of Matuta in the era of the *interpretationes* is interesting. As no Greek goddess corresponded to her in her central function (rosy-fingered *Hōs* is only a literary figure), she was learnedly assimilated to Leukothea, by virtue of two analogous details in the ritual. Although in the minds of the Romans, she remained the dawn goddess, the transferral of Leukothea's mythology to Matuta caused the latter's ancient mythology to be forgotten; on the other hand, it created a connection between her and a divinity who in primitive times had not concerned her in any respect: Portunus, who was assimilated to Palaimon, and became her son.

There is another question which we should like to ask in a useful manner but which, for lack of documentation, remains open. Had the other Latin peoples also lost their mythology? Had their divinities become as emaciated, as abstract, as those of Rome? A few rare indications suggest that certain ones had been less radically so. The Fortuna Primigenia of Praeneste, in the enigmatical conflict which defines her, is portrayed as being at the same time primordial, *primigenia*, and, contradictorily, the daughter of Jupiter, *puer Jouis*. As this conflict seems to be fundamental (it recalls a Vedic theologem on the same level), we are tempted to admit that the connection with Jupiter is an ancient one.¹² At Praeneste, again, there exists an inseparable pair of brothers whose typological kinship with Romulus and Remus is certain; nevertheless they are gods, and as gods they intervene in the story of the founding.¹³ This being so, we should

11. H. Wagenvoort, *Roman Dynamism*, p. 79. Recently, passing from one extreme to the other, the same author claimed to find in Rome the traces of an Indo-European conception of Paradise, "Indo-European Paradise Motifs in Virgil's IVth Eclogue," *Mnem.* 4th ser., 15 (1962): 133-45. Greater precautions are needed in making Indo-European reconstructions.

12. This is the subject matter of chap. 3 of *DL*. *Primigenius* does not mean "eldest" (with respect to brothers), but "primordial."

13. Below, p. 253.

perhaps not dismiss the account which, at Rome itself, makes the twin founders the sons of Mars, for the sole reason that divine relationships are foreign to the religious thought of the earliest Romans. Nor need the other variant, which also has a parallel at Praeneste, be a late invention. In this version the Roman twins are engendered by a phallus which appears on the hearth. Greece ignores this theme, and thus could not have furnished the story, but it is found in India, where the cult of the hearth bears a strong resemblance to that at Rome. Although it is not attested in Vedic literature, it occurs in many epic traditions which may be ancient, even if they were written down at a later date: Kārttikeya, god of war, is born from the desire which Agni, the personification of fire, conceives in the presence of noble women; he enters the domestic hearth (*gārhapatya*), and with flames (*śikhābhiḥ*) for organs, satisfies his lusts.¹⁴ Once again, however, the instances of this genre are too rare, and the religion of the other cities of Latium are too poorly known to permit any judgment.

If it has been proved that the Rome of the eighth century knew more mythology than the Rome of the third century, one must still realize that for lack of poets, and in contrast with Greece, this mythology was not literary or exposed to the temptations of literature, but rather was restricted to useful functions and "glued" to ritual. In this respect it was already deserving of the praises which Dionysius of Halicarnassus gives to the *theologia* of his era. Jupiter O.M., when we first meet him, is a serious and completely respectable gentleman, and it is highly unlikely that the Romans or their ancestors attributed to him the amatory adventures of his Hellenic homologue.

Finally, our peculiarly favorable situation with respect to the Matralia is not usual. Except for Matuta and Angerona there is almost no divinity whose ritual or figuration acts out or signifies a picturesque mythical activity which we can interpret completely. In the Lupercalia the obligatory laughter of two boys and the blood rubbed on their foreheads remain unexplained, doubtless for lack of parallels among other peoples, and also for lack of exact knowledge of who the divinity of the festival was. The Nonae Caprotinae may rest

14. Romulus: Plut. *Rom.* 2.7. Servius Tullius: Dion. 4.2.1-4, etc. Caeculus (Praeneste): Serv. *Aen.* 7.678; A. Brelich, *Vesta* (1949), pp. 70, 97-98. See Buchheit, *Vergil über die Sendung Roms* (1963), p. 95, n. 380. Kārttikeya: *Mbh.* 3.14291-92. Agni and the daughter of Nila: *Mbh.* 2. 1124-63.

on a lost myth of Juno; we cannot even guess at it. In fact, the justifications for a great many of the Roman festivals—at least for those which have any—are of a different type. They do not concern the gods, but rather men, the great men of the past. The race of the Luperi and their two teams supposedly arose from a circumstance in the life of the twin founders, and the flagellation on the same day from a calamity in Numa's time. The fires lighted on the Parilia are said to derive from an episode during the founding. A surely fictitious episode of the Gallic siege, taken from the folklore of war strategems, "explains" the cult of Jupiter Pistor. And so forth. But, for the greater part of the time, the label "historical" refers only to the establishment of the rites and does not explain their development. In this way a great many little etiological legends were formed, some purely human, others associating the gods with men. The greater number are of late invention and without interest beyond their attestation of a certain religious attitude. For example, the dickering between Jupiter and Numa, mentioned above, or even the "justifying" myth of the Larentalia on 23 December, which is a good specimen of the level of this literature.¹⁵ One day during the reign of Ancus Marcius, when the *aedituus* of the temple of Hercules was feeling bored, he proposed to the god that they gamble together. The stakes: the loser would serve the winner a sumptuous feast and would procure a beautiful girl for him. He rolled the dice, one hand for himself, the other for the god, and having lost, discharged his obligation. He placed the promised feast on the altar and locked into the temple the most celebrated of the light women of that time, Acca Larentina (Larentia). A flame coming out of the altar consumed the food, and the lady dreamed that the god enjoyed her and promised her that the first man she should meet on the following day would give her the customary little present. In fact, when she left the temple in the morning, she met, according to some a young man, according to others a graybeard, but in any case a very rich man who loved her, married her, and died leaving her an enormous inheritance. She in turn bequeathed this property, notably the real estate, to the Roman people, who in acknowledgment sacrifice on her tomb at Velabrum every 23 December, with important priests in attendance. There is of course nothing of value in this story, unless it is the suggestion that the recipient of the Laren-

15. Plut. *Rom.* 5.1-10, and Q.R. 35; Macr. 1.10.13-16. On *aedituus*, see Latte, p. 410.

talía had some ideological connection with wealth and pleasure. But her mythology as such has disappeared.

This kind of almost completely demythologized religion, surviving only in rites whose mythological and even theological justifications have been forgotten, is seldom found in other parts of the Indo-European world. The most remarkable case is that of the Indians of the former Kâfiristan in the Hindu Kush. This region became Nuristan at the end of the nineteenth century, when the Afghans imposed on it the "light" of Islam, *nur*, with the violence appropriate to this kind of attention. Living in their high valleys, the "Kâfirs," an intelligent and handsome people, had preserved until then an interesting religion, the features of which recall Vedism and which was observed *in extremis* by an English traveler, Sir George Scott Robertson, whose book is one of the masterpieces of ethnography.¹⁶ Robertson devoted two admirable chapters (23 and 24) to this religion, but he begins by making excuses which an observer of the Roman religion of the final centuries might have made if he substituted Hellenism for Islam and Athens or Rhodes for Chitrâl.

It must be remembered that the Bashgul Kâfirs are no longer an isolated community, in the strict sense of the word. They frequently visit Chitrâl and have dealings with other Musalman peoples as well. Many of their relatives have embraced Islam without abandoning the ties of relationship. One of the results of this free intercourse with Musalmans is that the Bashgul Kâfirs at the present day are very apt to mix their own religious traditions with those of their Musalman neighbors. This greatly confuses matters, and it is hopeless for me to try to write anything final, or even moderately comprehensive, concerning the religion of Kâfiristan; a modest record of what I actually saw and actually heard is all that can be attempted. Possibly a better acquaintance with the Bashgul language might have made many things clear to me which now remain dark, and perhaps had my interpreters been better the same result might have followed; but it appears to me that the chief reason why I discovered so little about the Kâfir faith is because the Kâfirs themselves know so little on the subject. It would seem that in Kâfiristan the forms of religion remain, while the philosophy which those forms were originally intended to symbolise is altogether forgotten. This is not, perhaps, surprising in a country in which there are no records of any kind, and everything depends on oral tradition.

16. *The Kâfirs of the Hindu-Kush* (1896). Robertson's visit took place in 1889-90. The lines cited here are on pp. 378-79.

The Bashgul Kâfirs, or at any rate the younger portion of the community, are inclined to be somewhat sceptical. They are superstitious, of course, but sacred ceremonies are frequently burlesqued or scoffed at when two or three waggish young men get together. Gish (the god of war and of warriors) is the really popular god of the Bashgul youth. In their worship of him there is a great sincerity. A young Kâfir once asked me if we English did not prefer Gish to Imrâ (the Creator), as he himself did, and many Kâfirs have expressed their disappointment on learning that Franks knew nothing of Gish.

The older people are devout in their respect for all the gods, but Bashgul Kâfirs seem ready to abandon their religion at any time without much regret. They leave it, as they return to it, chiefly from motives of material advantage, and rarely appear to trouble themselves about religious convictions.

These lines would be an excellent preface to the *Fasti* of Ovid.

FROM MYTHOLOGY TO HISTORY

By means of the substantial figure of Mater Matuta we have been brought back to the fundamental fact, already mentioned several times: the Indo-European heritage. In its organization of the state and in its religion during the earliest stages Rome reveals itself as the continuator of an Indo-European tradition. To what point does this heritage extend? Are other, non-Indo-European elements discernible before the Etruscan influence, before the Greek invasion? In what proportion were they associated and intermingled with one another? In short, we are confronting the problem of the substratum. How is it posed today?

A half-century ago André Piganiol proposed and developed a simple solution.¹ He admitted the authenticity of the "synoecism" which the annalistic tradition assigns to the beginnings. According to his solution, Rome was formed by the union of Latins and Sabines, the former being Indo-Europeans and the latter Mediterraneans, and the considerable contribution of each of the components could be recognized in the organization, in law, and in religion. Especially with respect to religion, the Indo-Europeans were responsible for the burials by cremation, the Sabines for the interments, which are juxtaposed and sometimes overlap in the *sepulcreto* of the Forum. The Indo-Europeans brought into Italy the altar bearing a lighted fire, the cult of the male fire, that of the sun, that of the bird, and a repugnance toward human sacrifices; the Sabines used stones which they rubbed with blood as altars, ascribed the patronage of fire to a goddess, offered worship to the moon and to the serpent, and immolated human victims. This construction was and could be only arbitrary. Apart

1. *Essai sur les origines de Rome* (1916). Discussed in Dumézil, NR, chap. 3 ("Latins et Sabins: histoire et mythe").

from the fact that the Sabines, who were themselves Indo-Europeans, could not play the role of "Mediterraneans" which was entrusted to them, there was then no means of taking an objective view either of Indo-European civilization or of Mediterranean civilization. The author was thus free, too free, in dividing between these peoples the two terms of many antithetical pairs of beliefs, practices, or institutions which he claimed to observe in historical Rome. In later works, some of the most obviously debatable statements have been modified by the author, but he seems to have maintained the principle of the double origin of Roman civilization and to have confirmed the Sabines, against all probability, in their role of Mediterraneans. To the best of my knowledge, he has not disavowed the summary and *a priori* method which governed these dichotomies and the distribution of their terms between the two components.²

For the past thirty years the idea of Indo-European civilization has progressed appreciably by the only admissible procedure, comparison. The comparative study of the most ancient documents from India, Iran, Rome, Scandinavia, and Ireland has allowed us to give it a content and to recognize a great number of facts about civilization, and especially religion, which were common to these diverse societies or at least to several of them. Many of these agreements, such as the one which has just been summed up concerning Dawn, are so singular that they cannot be interpreted otherwise than as the heritage of Indo-European conceptions. Several also are interdependent, complementing and articulating one another in such a way that it is not an inorganic dusting of more or less considerable concordances which we find but entire structures of representations. This is not true of the notion of a "Mediterranean civilization."³ Despite many worthy

2. In 1949, however, in a public course, the author sketched out another analysis of the facts of Roman religion which it does not seem easy to reconcile with the Latin-Sabine dichotomy and which we should like to see developed. All that I know about it is what is printed in the *Annuaire du Collège de France*, 1950, p. 200: "The course has been devoted almost entirely to the problem of the origins. The professor has sought to link the study of the religious phenomenon closely with that of economic and social life, and to discover in the series of festivals the rhythm of the life of the nomadic shepherds, the sedentary farmers, and even, more distantly, the hunters. He has had to take up once more the problem of the Indo-European religion."

3. Despite my disagreement on many details of method, I pay my respects to the labors, notably, of Mme L. Zambotti, *Il Mediterraneo, l'Europa, l'Italia durante la preistoria* (1954); of U. Pestalozza, *Pagine di religione mediterranea*, vols. 1-2 (1942-45), and *Religione mediterranea* (1951). For a wealth of information and a debatable method, M. Marconi, *Kjillessi mediterranei nella più antica religione laziale* (1939).

efforts, this notion remains confused and continues to thrive on the arbitrary. Here too, the comparison of several related areas would be the only possible method of exploration, but there is not the point of departure, the support, which linguistic kinship provides for the Indo-Europeans. The general unity or the great partial unities that are presumed in the Mediterranean basin, regardless of the unknown languages and the indeterminable ethnic relationships and migrations, are necessarily uncertain. Moreover, the data which are used are almost exclusively archaeological, a fact which allows, as we know, the most generous interpretations.

Fortunately, the question of the substratum no longer has the importance which the *Essai* of 1916 attributed to it. In contrast with the Greeks who overran the Minoan world, the diverse bands of Indo-Europeans who descended on Italy certainly did not have to confront great civilizations. Those among them who occupied the site of Rome do not even seem to have been preceded by a dense and stable settlement, and traditions like the one dealing with Cacus suggest that some of the indigens encamped on the banks of the Tiber were as simply and summarily ousted as the Tasmanians were to be, in the Antipodes, by the traders coming from Europe.⁴ It will not be concluded that everything in primitive Rome was a heritage from Indo-European ancestors: much may have been created on the spot to fill new needs; much also, as happened frequently in the following centuries, may have been borrowed from the other peoples of the peninsula, who were themselves for the most part heirs to the Indo-European past. But it is out of the question that there could have been at Rome a mixture in equal parts of Indo-Europeans and pre-Indo-Europeans.

If this question of the substratum thus loses its importance, it is replaced by another: the question of the homogeneity or the duality of the Indo-European founders of Rome. Was Rome born out of the development, or the conquests, of one group or several closely associated groups of Latins, or was it produced, as some claim they can infer from the annalistic tradition, by a fusion of this group or groups with a group of Sabines? As can be seen, the terms are appreciably the same as in Piganiol's problem, but they have a different coloration,

4. The traditions about the Aborigines seem to be purely legendary and scholarly.

since the two component elements are now both Indo-European. The stakes are no less important: they are the meaning of the god Quirinus, and consequently the meaning of Rome's oldest known theological structure, the triad formed by Jupiter, Mars, and Quirinus.

The greater number of modern historians, although with growing hesitation, continue to incline toward duality, toward synoecism.⁵ Considering the actual state of the dossier, this is an act of faith which is not supported by archaeology or by toponymy or even by the annalistic tradition as it is clarified by external criteria.

A number of authors assume, as Piganiol did in his *Essai* and as F. von Dahn did in 1924 in the first volume of his *Italische Gräberkunde*, that the duality of burial practices, cremation and inhumation, is a serious presumption in favor of the duality of population. It is not. In many countries and many eras, the two ways of treating the corpse have coexisted without there being any difference of race or language between those who practiced them, and even without any difference in the manner of conceiving the beyond, the life after death. Not to leave the Indo-European world, the Vedic Indians practiced them concurrently. Cremation is dominant in their texts, but the fourteenth strophe of the funeral hymn RV 10.15 mentions conjointly the ancestors who were consumed by fire and those who were not, while strophes 10.18.10-13 certainly refer to inhumation; however, all the dead go to Yama. In Scandinavia, where civilization retained a high degree of homogeneity and where the movements of peoples were restricted for a long time, the explanation of the instability of funerary practices by ethnic differences or changes has been abandoned. Of the first two centuries of the Christian era, a period when the influence of Rome was felt, J. de Vries comments:

... the variety of funerary usages is particularly great. While in Gotland tombs with interred bodies and offerings of weapons are predominant, in Norway and Sweden cinerary burials are in the majority, even though inhumations are found there too. In these two countries offerings of weapons are the rule, while they are completely lacking in Denmark. Undoubtedly we must admit that these differences are due to local and historical circumstances. In any case, they are not qualified primarily by divergences in representations of life beyond the grave, but rather by the variable currents of commerce, and consequently of culture, acting on Scandinavia.⁶

5. This, it seems, is also Latte's position, p. 113 and n. 2.

6. *Altgermanische Religionsgeschichte* I² (1956), §109, p. 148.

A little later, when the entire Germanic world was unsettled by the *Völkerwanderung*, it is certainly possible that the new provincial distribution of practices can be explained in part by the displacement of tribes, but, as the same author notes, "in the course of this period the mixing of the different kinds of tombs is pushed to the point where one finds incinerated and interred remains in the same family burial plot."⁷ Viewing the *sepulcreto* of the Forum and the sparse necropolises of the Roman hills, we must not forget these examples.⁸ On this subject Raymond Bloch remarked, before obviously sentimental reasons led him to support the opposite theory, "Latium occupies a marginal position, peripheral with respect to the zones from which emerge, respectively, the typical Villanovan and the sub-Apennine iron civilization, namely, southern maritime Etruria and the Osco-Umbrian territory. These two neighboring zones may explain the interaction of cultural influences of diverse origins on Latin territory and particularly on the site of Rome."⁹

Ethnic duality would seem probable if the traces of material civilization, notably ceramics and ornaments, were appreciably different on the Palatine, the Esquiline, and the Quirinal. This is not the case. F. Villard, who has meticulously examined the ceramics on the site of Rome between the eighth and the fifth centuries, has not found any difference, and with respect to the second half of the eighth century—the beginnings—he believes accordingly in the homogeneity of the population.¹⁰

The remaining arguments for duality are feeble. That the northern heights of Rome are called *colles* (*collis Quirinalis*, *collis Viminalis*) as opposed to the *montes* which lie beyond the Forum—the Palatine, the Caelian, the Cispan, the Oppian, the Fagutaline—is certainly an important difference which may have an explanation in history, bearing witness for example to a progressive extension. But *collis* is a Latin word with the same claims as *mons*, and nothing allows us to say that the *colles* were originally Sabine and the *montes* Roman.

7. *Ibid.*, §114, p. 152.

8. See the discussion of H. Müller-Karpe, *Vom Anfang Roms*, RM, supplement 5 (1959), pp. 36–39. By contrast E. Gjerstad, *Gnomon* 33 (1961): 378–82, takes his position in the line of F. von Duhn.

9. *Les origines de Rome* (1959), p. 86.

10. "Céramiques des premiers siècles de Rome, VIII^e-V^e siècles" (unpublished), according to the analytic report (by A. Piganiol) in CRAI (1950), p. 292.

These variations are instructive concerning chronology but not concerning the nature or the nationality of the population.

An attempt has also been made to deduce ethnic duality from geography or, to use a recent term, geopolitics. We are told that the then marshy valley of the Forum and Suburra was a veritable frontier: on one side the heights of the Palatine, the Caelian, and the Esquiline formed as it were a projection of Latium toward the Tiber; on the other side the Quirinal, extended by the Capitol and doubled by the Viminal, played the same role, at least with respect to those of the Sabines who also came down toward the Tiber via the salt route. Was it not natural that each of these groups should seize the advantage and occupy, on an important commercial site, the positions which were offered to it? There is no need to point out the subjective nature of these speculations. If one agrees to play this game, it can also be objected that the most "interesting" northern hill for the Sabines to occupy was not the Quirinal, but the Capitol, near the Tiber and facing the Palatine; it might also be remarked that it was "natural" for the Latin possessors of the *montes* to occupy forward positions on the Quirinal from which an enemy might threaten the Esquiline. But what good purpose is served by this display of ingenuity? Geopolitics may help to account *a posteriori* for known history, but it does not allow us to reconstruct unknown history.¹¹

In fact, if one were to judge solely from the evidence of the excavations or from a map of the hills, one could not possibly assume an ethnic duality, a juxtaposition and then an association of Sabines and Latins. The annalistic tradition, however, under conditions which differ radically from those that have been deduced from the archaeological evidence, tells a dualistic story. Whatever one may pretend, it is chapters 8–13 of Livy's first book and the parallel texts which continue to form the principal argument. The grounds, the tombs, and the ceramics have been subjected to interrogation, and sometimes to entreaty, to supply evidence in the light of the traditional story of the origins. Thus, after loyally acknowledging that archaeology does not prove the "concrete and actual coming of some tribes, each contributing a different civilization," Raymond Bloch returns to the

11. Cf. JMQ 4: 182.

vulgate: "However, the agreement between the massive data of the annalistic tradition and the elements of information provided by the excavations seems sufficient for one to admit, on the whole, the idea that two diverse populations, Latin and Sabine, were present in the origins of Rome."¹² Similarly, after making a bold interpretation of the topography, Jean Bayet concludes, "Thus the earliest annalistic tradition takes on verisimilitude: from a double settlement, Latin and Sabine, of the site; from a double religious contribution, ascribed to the first kings, the Alban Romulus and Numa of Cures, but under the less schematic aspect of progressive relations (of war and peace) between the originally distinct inhabitants."¹³ We have seen the uncertainty in which we are left by topography and the "elements of information provided by excavations." What then are "the massive data of the annalistic tradition," "the earliest annalistic tradition," and what is their meaning?

The story of Rome's first war is very well fabricated, but it is plainly a fabrication. In the clearly revealed characters and the advantages held by each side; in the sequence of well-balanced battle episodes, none of which is decisive and which bring into play, one after another, these characters and these advantages; in the unforeseen yet basically logical development which turns a desperate war into something better than an alliance, an intimate fusion; beneath the armed maneuvers and the human passions we see a game of a different kind being unfolded, described, and demonstrated, a rigorous game of concepts. Understood in this way, the story of the formation of the full Roman society is exactly parallel to those accounts, not "historical" but mythical, which are known to other Indo-European peoples. These accounts tell how the full society of the gods was formed, starting with two groups originally juxtaposed, then opposed in a war with alternating victories and defeats, and finally united in a true fusion. I reproduce here the comparative analysis of the Roman and Scandinavian accounts which I published in 1949 in *L'héritage indo-européen à Rome*, summing up earlier works:

I. Here in the beginning, before the war, is the description of the two opposing sides:

12. *Les origines de Rome*, p. 86.

13. *Histoire politique et psychologique de la religion romaine* (1957), p. 23.

1. On one side, Romulus. He is the son of Mars and the protégé of Jupiter. He has just founded the city in ritual form, having received the auspices and marked out the sacred furrow. He and his companions are magnificent youths, strong and brave. This side has two trump cards: it has the great gods with it and partially in it, and it is full of warlike qualities. On the other hand, it has gross deficiencies in terms of wealth and fecundity: it is poor, and it is without women.

2. On the other side, Titus Tatius with his wealthy Sabines. To be sure, they are neither cowardly nor irreligious—quite the contrary—but at this point in history they are defined as rich. Moreover, they possess the women that Romulus and his companions need.

Before they confront each other, before they even dream of confronting each other, the two sides are thus complementary. And it is because they are complementary that Romulus, realizing that his incomplete society cannot survive, has “the Sabine women” carried off in the course of the rustic festival of Consus. He acts in this way both to obtain the women and to oblige the rich Sabines, despite their repugnance, to enter into relations with his savage band.

All the authors agree in stressing and making explicit this conceptual, functional motive of the earliest events. Reread in Livy 1.9.2–4, the instructions which Romulus gives to his ambassadors when, before resorting to violence, he sends them to the surrounding cities. They are charged to tell their future fathers-in-law:

“Cities, . . . as well as all other things, take their rise from the lowliest beginnings. As time goes on, those which are aided by their own valor and by the favour of the gods achieve great power and renown. They said they were well assured that Rome’s origin had been blessed with the favour of the gods, and that valor would not be lacking; their neighbours should not be reluctant to mingle their stock and their blood with the Romans, who were as truly men as they were.”

Di and *uirtus*, the gods and courage or manly energy, define very well the bases of the first two functions; *opes*, resources, power consisting of property, of the means of action, and also the means of fertility and propagation, here designated by *sanguis ac genus*, characterize the third equally well. *Di*, meaning the divine ancestry of the two brothers and the promise given by the auspices on the site of the future Rome, constitutes the double supernatural element which they bring as a dowry; as for *uirtus*, they have not yet tested it in actual combat, but they feel it within themselves. *Opes* is the only factor which they do not yet have, either potentially or actually, and which is not ascribed to their nature. When they shall have acquired it and intermingled with it *sanguinem*, the synthesis of the three principles which were originally

distributed between the two neighboring peoples will assure Rome of its place in history, *nomen*. And in fact the synthesis will have this result. Another historian, Florus, summing up the war very schematically (1.1), writes that after the reconciliation the Sabines moved to Rome and *cum generis suis auitas opes pro dote sociant*, sharing their hereditary riches, like a dowry, with their sons-in-law.

In the third book of his *Fasti* (lines 178-99) Ovid provides the same conceptual substructure to the event, but in dramatic form. It is the god Mars himself who tells how he inspired his son Romulus with the idea of carrying off the Sabine women:

"Wealthy neighbours scorned to take poor men for their sons-in-law; hardly did they believe that I myself was the author of the breed. . . . I chafed and said, 'Thy father's temper, Romulus, I have bestowed on thee. A truce to prayers! What thou seekest, arms will give.'"

Here once more Romulus's two trumps are first his divine birth, with a god as *auctor sanguinis*, and second, thanks to a direct inspiration from this god, a warlike temperament, *patriam mentem*, and arms, *arma*. His opponents are rich men, *uicinia diues*, who scorn his *inopia*.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus (2.30.2 and 37.2), wordy as always, and following a slightly different tradition (involving not two, but three races, among whom the three trumps are distributed), still expresses the same fundamental structure. Sounded out by Romulus for matrimonial alliances, the Latin cities refuse to join these newcomers "who neither are powerful by reason of their wealth nor have performed any brilliant exploit." For Romulus, thus reduced to his quality as son of a god and to the promises of Jupiter, there remains nothing to do but to rely on professional soldiers, which he does, summoning among other reinforcements Lucumo of Solonium, "a man of action and reputation for military achievements."

Such is the structure of the entire plot: the need, the temptation, the intention, and the action of Romulus all have as their goal the formation of a complete society by imposing on the "wealthy" the necessity of associating with the "brave" and the "godlike."

II. The war itself falls into two episodes. In each, one of the two sides is almost victorious, but each time the original situation is restored, and a final decision is postponed.

1. First there is the episode of Tarpeia. It is told in different ways, sometimes (these are the most beautiful forms: Propertius . . .) with the passion of love as the motive; but it seems to have its purest form in the version adopted by Livy (1.11.5-9). Titus Tatius, the head of the wealthy Sabines, using as a

bribe the gold, the bracelets, and the jewels which sparkle on the arms of his men, seduces the daughter of the Roman who is entrusted with guarding the essential position of the Capitoline. Treacherously admitted into this dominant fortress, the Sabines seem about to be victorious.¹⁴

2. In fact, they almost are, when the second episode occurs. This time it is Romulus who seizes the advantage (Liv. 1.12.1-9). In the course of the battle in the valley of the Forum between Romulus's companions, who have been driven back to the Palatine, and Tatius's Sabines, who control the Capitoline, the former yield and fall back in disorder. Then Romulus raises his sword toward heaven and says, "O Jupiter, it was thy omen that directed me when I laid here on the Palatine the first foundations of my city. . . . But do thou . . . deliver the Romans from their terror, and stay. I here vow to thee, O Jupiter, the Stayer, a temple, to be a memorial to our descendants from the City saved by thy present help."

"Having uttered this prayer he exclaimed, as if he had perceived that it was heard, 'Here, Romans, Jupiter Optimus Maximus commands us to stand and renew the fight!' The Romans did stand, . . . and . . . fired by the reckless daring of their king, drove the Sabines before them."

Thus Romulus counters the criminal bribery (*scelere emptum*) of Titus Tatius with an appeal to the sovereign Jupiter, the greatest god whose auspices have guaranteed the grandeur of Rome. And from this god he obtains an immediate mystical or magical intervention, which against every expectation reverses the morale of the two armies and changes the fortunes of battle.

We see the meaning of these two episodes and the way in which they are applied constitutively to the descriptions of the two sides as they were first presented: the Romans and the Sabines, Romulus and Titus Tatius, engage in battle, and on equal terms, and it is neither courage nor strategic skill which distinguishes one from the other. But each of them, the chief of the wealthy Sabines on one side and the demigod Romulus on the other, has his own way of intervening in the battle and causing victory to incline toward himself. The wealthy man with his riches has recourse to gold, to the shameful trick of corruption, not by means of money at that time but by means of jewels—the kind of corruption most effective with a woman; the demigod obtains from the all-powerful Jupiter the gratuitous miracle which changes a defeat into victory. To understand the logical structure of this entire arrangement, it is only necessary to state the impossibility of imagining that the roles are reversed, that it is Romulus who resorts to bribery and Titus Tatius who

14. On Tarpeia, see my essay at the end of the book bearing this name (1947) and my note, *REL* 38 (1960): 98-99. The theme is definitely borrowed from Greece. A. H. Krappe, *RhM* 78 (1929): 249-67.

obtains the miracle from Jupiter: this would have no meaning. Titus Tatius and Romulus act not only in accordance with their characters, but in accordance with the functions which they represent.

III. How does the war end? No military decision has occurred. The demigod has neutralized the wealthy man, the miracle of the celestial god has balanced the power of gold, and the struggle threatens to go on forever. Then unexpectedly the reconciliation takes place; the women cast themselves between their fathers and their ravishers. And everything turns out so well that the Sabines decide to merge with Romulus's companions, bringing to them as a dowry, as Florus says, *auitas opes*. The two kings become colleagues, and each institutes a cult: Romulus to Jupiter alone, and Titus Tatius to a whole series of gods connected with fecundity and with the soil, among whom Quirinus figures. Never again, either under this double reign or later, will we hear talk of dissension between the Sabine element and the Latin, Alban, "Romulean" element of Rome. The society is complete. A chemist would say that the valences of the diverse elements have saturated each other reciprocally. To use Livy's words again, Romulus's group, which in the beginning had *deos et uirtutem* on its side, has gained what it was lacking, *opes*, as well as the Sabine women, the pledges of national fecundity.

We see that from one end to the other the logical connection, the significative intention, and the necessity of the episodes are clear. Everything is oriented toward a single meaning, everything states and presents a single lesson; it is the history, in three stages, of the formation of a complete city, starting with its presumed preexistent and originally separate functional components. First stage: the presentation of these separate incomplete components, of which at least one, the superior component, is unfulfilled and not viable as such; second stage: the war, in which each component expresses its genius in a characteristic episode (gold on the one side, grand magic on the other, dominating the combat proper); third stage: an association of these components, unforeseen but nonetheless firm and definitive, in a unified society. And the history of Rome begins.

Where did the Romans get this schema from? In principle, one might believe that they got it from nowhere and from nobody, that it is the peculiar product of their genius, that they invented it, in the full meaning of the word. But it is here that a comparison with the traditions of other Indo-European peoples furnishes a light which Latin philology by itself cannot supply and resolves an uncertainty from which literary criticism cannot escape by itself. In fact, other Indo-European peoples also use an articulated history to explain the formation of a complete society in accordance with the system of the three functions, starting with originally disparate elements. I shall confine

myself to reproducing briefly the Scandinavian version of this tradition, the account of the war, and then of the reconciliation of the Æsir and Vanir.

We are not concerned here with an ordinary human society, but a divine society, the difference being further heightened by the fact that in at least one of the usable texts the gods composing this divine society turn out to be the ancestors of a human, Scandinavian society, and that we pass insensibly from one to the other. The story is known to us from two texts of the Icelandic scholar Snorri Sturluson and from four strophes of a fine Eddaic poem, the *Völuspá*, "The Prophecy of the Seeress." As we might expect, hypercriticism has attempted to deny all validity to these two testimonies. Eugen Mogk tried to make Snorri a kind of forger, from whose works one can keep nothing but what one knows from other sources; and on the basis of extremely unreliable arguments he claimed to have demonstrated that the four strophes of the *Völuspá* are irrelevant to the whole matter which here concerns us. A double discussion, which there can be no question of reproducing or even of summing up here, has proved the error of the argument based on the condemnation of Snorri and the dismissal of strophes 21-24 of the *Völuspá*. Here, in three stages, is the sequence of events.

I. The Scandinavians recognize two well-characterized tribes of gods, the Æsir and the Vanir. The Æsir are the gods who surround Óðinn and þórr ("Ásapórr," as he is sometimes called). Óðinn in particular, their head, is a combination of god, king, and magician, the patron of earthly chieftains and sorcerers, the possessor of magical runes and generally of powers which allow him immediate action in all his domains; þórr, the god armed with a hammer, is the great heavenly battler, the giant-killer, whose most famous actions are involved with punitive expeditions, and whom one calls on in order to win in single combat. The Vanir on the other hand are the gods of fecundity, wealth, and pleasure; myths and cults indicative of this quality grew up around the three principal gods of the Vanir—Njörðr (whom Tacitus describes in his *Germania* as the goddess Nerthus), Freyr, and Freyja.

Snorri (*Ynglingasaga* 1-2), who anthropomorphizes them to the highest degree, localizes the Æsir and the Vanir, as neighbors but completely separate, in the region of the lower "Tanaïs," near the Black Sea. One group inhabits Ásaland or Ásaheimr, with Ásgarðr as their castle-capital; the other inhabits Vanaland or Vanaheimr.

II. Second stage (Snorri, *Yngl.* 4, beginning; *Völuspá* 21-24). The Æsir attack the Vanir, and there ensues, as the poem says, "war for the first time in the world." "Óðinn," says Snorri, "marched with his army against the Vanir; but the latter resisted and defended their country; now one side, now the other, was victorious; each devastated the other's country, and they inflicted mutual losses on each other."

From the precipitate, allusive poem we know the two episodes—the only two—of the war:

1. A sorceress named Gullveig “Frenzy (or Power) of Gold,” apparently one of the Vanir or sent by them, comes to the Æsir; the latter burn her and then burn her again in Óðinn’s hall, but do not succeed in killing her altogether; she continues to live as a witch; in particular, she “is always the delight of wicked women.”¹⁵

2. Óðinn, the great magician-god, chief of the Æsir, hurls his spear at the enemy, making for the first time the magical gesture which several of the texts later attribute to human chieftains, and the intention of which they specify: as is said in a comparable case, the *Eyrbyggjasaga* (44.13), it is a matter of “gaining heill, luck, by magic”; and in the *Styrbjarnar þáttur Sviakappa* (chap. 2 = *Fornmanna Sögur* 5: 250), it is Óðinn himself who gives King Eric of Sweden a canestalk and tells him to hurl it over the enemy army while pronouncing the words, “Óðinn possesses you all!” Eric follows the god’s advice: in mid-air the stalk turns into a spear, and the enemies flee, seized by a panic fear. It is the prototype of this gesture which Óðinn makes, a gesture which should assure him of victory. Nevertheless, it does not succeed, since the same strophe later describes the breaking of the Æsir’s rampart by the Vanir.

III. Worn out by this costly alternation of half-victories, the Æsir and the Vanir make peace. An unforeseen peace, as complete as the war was desperate; a peace whereby, at first as hostages, then as equals or “nationals,” the

15. Quite recently J. de Vries, who approved on the whole of my analysis, has proposed a new exegesis of strophes 21–22 of the *Völuspa*, which seems to me too critical and at the same time too free (*ANF* 77 [1962]: 42–47). Moreover, if he were right, we would still have what the two allusions of these lines tell of the Vanir people on the one side, and Óðinn on the other, each using his characteristic means against the opposing side: the Vanir’s *seiðr* and Óðinn’s spear. I think, however, that these two strophes need to be clarified and understood with the help of the most continuous forms of the myth: (1) Snorri assures us that the two sides achieve alternating advantages, without any decisive result; (2) the plagiarism of the myth by Saxo Grammaticus (1.7.1), with his account of the golden statue sent to Othinus and of the corruption caused by this gold in the heart of Othinus’s wife, is confirmation that we should give the name *Gullveig* its full meaning, and that line 22.4 does not allude to the “incest” of the Vanir, but to the corruption of the Ase woman by her desire for gold. I refer the reader to chapter 7 of my *Saga de Hadingus, du mythe au roman* (1953), especially pp. 105–11 (cf. *Les dieux des Germains* [1959], chap. 1). I still prefer what J. de Vries has said about the war of the Æsir and the Vanir in *Altgermanische Religionsgeschichte* II² (1957), pp. 208–14; cf. W. Betz, *Die altgermanische Religion*, in W. Stammer, *Deutsche Philologie im Aufriß*², cols. 1557–58 and *passim*. I cannot discuss here Heino Gehrts, “Die Gulveig-mythe der Völuspá,” *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* 88 (1969): 321–78. I only remark that there is no internal contradiction (p. 359) in my treatment of Óðinn’s spear-thrust. Of course, the myth is etiological, but what it justifies is not this particular gesture of Óðinn, but the constitution of a complete society; for this reason Óðinn’s gesture, which normally could not miss its intended effect, victory, *must* fail in this particular case: just as Romulus, who in all other wars could not miss victory, *must* be unable to win the Sabine war, the end of which *must* be a compromise, a reconciliation.

principal Vanir, the gods Njörðr and Freyr and the goddess Freyja, by the fecundity and wealth which they represent, come to complete the society of the gods of Óðinn. So well do they complete this society that when "King" Óðinn dies (for in the *Ynglingasaga* the gods are a kind of supermen who die like ordinary mortals), it is Njörðr, and after him Freyr, who become kings of the Æsir. Never again, in any circumstance, is there the shadow of a conflict between the Æsir and the Vanir, and the word "Æsir," except when the contrary is specified, designates Njörðr, Freyr, and Freyja as well as Óðinn and Þórr.

There is no need to stress the exact parallelism not only of the ideological values which provide the point of departure but also of the intrigues from the beginning to the end, including the two episodes which describe the war between the rich gods and the magician gods. It seems hardly imaginable that chance should have twice created this vast structure, especially in view of the fact that other Indo-European peoples have homologous accounts. The simplest and humblest explanation is to admit that the Romans, as well as the Scandinavians, received this scenario from a common earlier tradition and that they simply modernized its details, adapting them to their own "geography," "history," and customs and introducing the names of countries, peoples, and heroes suggested by actuality.¹⁶

This explanation accommodates itself to Mommsen's. It gives an account of themes, while Mommsen's is concerned with names.¹⁷ If the preexisting, Indo-European account of the formation of a complete society appears here exemplified in the ethnic framework of the Latins, the Sabines, and eventually the Etruscans, it was the later demographic movement of Rome which suggested it; in the fifth and fourth centuries, as we know from definite clues, an afflux of Sabine population actually did settle in the already established city and on the hills to the north. If the final treaty establishing synoecism was framed in the terms and style of which we read, it is in the image of the *collatio civitatis* which in 290 B.C. actually did somehow merge the two societies.¹⁸

16. *Hér.* pp. 127-42; see above, p. 7, n. 3, and below, p. 73, n. 18.

17. Above, pp. 21-23. If it should be possible to demonstrate some day, archaeologically, that there was an ethnic duality in the origins of Rome, the account given by the annalistic tradition would still remain entirely "prefabricated"; the historicized myth would merely be superimposed on history.

18. See now my exposé of the second part ("Naissance d'un peuple") of *ME 1* discussing especially J. Poucet, *Recherches sur la légende sabine des origines de Rome* (1967).

The tendency to make use of preexisting legends, epic or mythic, in order to establish the beginnings of a history is certainly natural to man, for one observes its effects whenever one reads such a history. I shall cite only one example, remarkable because it is not yet a hundred years old. It concerns another people with an Indo-European language and tradition and bears on the same matter which at Rome formed the legend of the two peoples. The Ossetes of the Caucasus, sprung from the Alans, are the only existing descendants of the Scythian family, a fact which in every respect gives them an importance out of keeping with their small numbers. Their language, which is Iranian, is the last survivor of a vast group of dialects, and their stories and popular rituals, which were not collected until the nineteenth century but are very ancient, often correspond with the descriptions which Herodotus, Lucian, and Ammianus give of the Scythians and the Sarmatae. In particular they have a collection of epic legends, which has spread throughout all of the northern Caucasus, concerning the Narts, a fabulous people of ancient times. These people consisted essentially of three families, each defined by a characteristic quality, and the union of these qualities forms a structure which is a visible continuation of the social classification—sometimes theoretical, sometimes practical—common to all the Indo-Iranians, into priests, warriors, and herdsman-warriors: the Wise (*Alægatæ*), the Strong (*Æhsærtægkatæ*), and the Rich (*Boratæ*). A considerable number of the stories are devoted to the bitter struggles of the Strong and the Rich, with each family demonstrating its natural advantage: on one side pure valor (sometimes assisted by great magic), on the other opulence, trickery (sometimes dishonest) and great numbers of men. The first Russian observer to record these stories was seized with enthusiasm and by means of very bad plays on words used them to construct the “prehistory” of the Ossetes. Briefly, according to him, the *Boratæ*, a kind of Sabines, were the earliest inhabitants of the country, which was later invaded by the *Æhsærtægkatæ*, foreigners coming from the north of Iran. The wars which the epic texts relate were wars of installation and ended with a fusion; after the death of the principal hero of the *Æhsærtægkatæ* his surviving companions settled down with their conquerors. V. B. Pfaff, who made this reconstruction, was an important man. The first review of Caucasian studies, which was in its fourth volume (1870), could not

reject his article, but the editors appended to it a flattering note in which they disclaimed all responsibility.¹⁹ This "historical operation" was without a sequel. The nineteenth century was already too critical, and another scholar, V. F. Miller, the true founder of Ossetic studies, was already at work. The situation was not the same in Iceland at the end of the twelfth century when Snorri, humanizing the Æsir and Vanir gods, used myth as the basis for "the earliest history" of Scandinavia; not at Rome, three or four centuries before our era, when respectable scholars filled in the gaps of time and space in Latium with the old traditional myth explaining how a society is formed on the basis of three (or two) groups, each being the trustee of one (or two) of the three functions necessary to its normal life.

The war of Romulus and Tatius thus presents an early example of the historicization of myths, of the transposition of fables into events; this process was frequently used by the annalists or their predecessors, and is characteristic even of Rome at this stage. During the past quarter of a century a number of similar examples have been revealed in the history of the royal period, as well as in the history of the first war of the Republic. The structured antithesis of Romulus and Numa defines two equally wholesome and necessary types of power, corresponding to those of the Vedic sovereign gods Varuṇa and Mitra.²⁰ The whole story of the third reign, and especially the victory of the third Horatius over the three Curiatii, reproduces the mythical career of the warrior-god Indra, in particular the victory of the hero Trita, "Third," over the triple demon.²¹ Consider further the two mutilated men, whose conjunction at this stage of history is in itself improbable. Cocles and Scaevola, the Cyclops and the Left-hander, successively save Rome when it is besieged by Porsenna, one paralyzing the Etruscan army by the dazzling glance of his eye, the other sacrificing his right hand before the Etruscan leader in a heroic act of perjury. These two form a pair paralleling the one-eyed god and the one-handed god of the Scandinavians, Óðinn and Týr. The former of

19. *Sbornik svědění o kavkazských gorach* 4 (1870), pt. 1, sec. 3, pp. 1 (with n.1)–7, esp. pp. 4–5. See the whole story in ME 1:545–49.

20. MV, chap. 2; summed up in ME 1: 274–78.

21. *Aspekte . . .* chap. 1 (now also *The Destiny of the Warrior* [1970], chap. 1), where one can find a criticism of the thesis (of H. J. Rose, etc.) which sees in the story of the Horatii and the Curiatii an ingenious fiction fabricated on the basis of the names of places or preexisting objects (*Tigillum Sororium*, *Pila Horatia*, *Janus Curiatius . . .*); summed up in ME 1: 278–80.

these, because he has sacrificed an eye, receives supernatural wisdom as compensation, while the other saves the gods by thrusting his right hand into the jaws of the demon-wolf.²²

And so the information afforded by a consideration of the rites of Mater Matuta is completed. There was indeed a Roman mythology, just as rich as that of the Vedic Indians and the Scandinavians. To be sure, large parts of it related to a great number of gods have disappeared. But other parts, and the most important ones—the three cases which have just been cited concern the ideological provinces of Jupiter and Mars—have survived. The myths have merely been transferred from the world of the gods to the world of men, and their heroes are not gods but the great men of Rome, who have assumed the characteristics of those gods. In later times they continued, and perhaps even more successfully, to act out the parts of *exempla*, providing incentives and justifications, which is one of the functions of mythology.

To return to our point of departure, the comparative interpretation which has just been suggested by the account of Rome's first war eliminates one of the traditional explanations of the god Quirinus. The meaning of this god, as we shall soon see, is one of the cardinal points, indeed it is the hinge of the study in which we are engaged. According to the way in which one conceives him, whether as a god of the earliest Roman or even of a pre-Roman society, or as a god imported and superadded by a foreign element, Sabine for example, everything depends, and not merely in his sphere; Jupiter, Mars, and many fertility gods are interdependent with him. We shall observe him later at our leisure, but we can record this important negative fact: the account of synoecism in the annalistic tradition, being of mythical origin, cannot be regarded as a basis for the theory of a Sabine Quirinus.²³

Despite the striking fidelity of important authors to the idea of a primitive Sabine element,²⁴ it seems to be losing ground. Other

22. MV chap. 9 ("Le Borgne et le Manchot"); ME 1: 424-28.

23. A second consideration, the parallelism of the facts at Iguvium, will completely eliminate this thesis; see below, pp. 149-50.

24. This conviction readily replaces the proofs which it lacks with heated affirmation and an appeal to authority. Thus C. Koch, *Religio* (1960), p. 25: "Jedenfalls gibt es heute keinen Bodenforscher, der es wagte," etc. The arguments of Jacques Heurgon in favor of a Sabine component in the earliest population of Rome, *Rome et la Méditerranée orientale jusqu'aux*

authors, no less important, have recently abandoned it. But even among the latter group, when it comes to Quirinus, there is something in the manner of explanation suggested by the annalistic tradition. The *collis Quirinalis*, they say, whether settled by Sabines or Latins, whether facing the Palatine-Equiline region or being the advance outpost of this region, was in any case the hill of Quirinus and was named after Quirinus. As this locality, lying outside the first grouping of the *montes*, did not become part of the *urbs* until later, by a true synoecism, its special god must have joined the common pantheon at this stage. Except for nationality, the explanation of the presence of Quirinus and of his role in Roman religion does not undergo any change; he is always an originally separate god—attached, if not to a separate people, then at least to an external place—who will only secondarily be added to the gods of the *montes*. We shall discuss this explanation later, but it must be shown here that it is neither self-evident nor logically necessary. In fact it rests on an unexpressed postulate—namely, that the hill was named *Quirinalis* before its incorporation into the city, and that Quirinus was its special, eponymous god from the time of the earliest settlement. But things might have occurred differently. The other hill in the northern sector, the Capitol, never officially took the name “hill of Jupiter”; yet in the course of history it became the cultic abode of this god, who was certainly worshipped from the earliest times on the same level as Mars. The connections between Quirinus and the terrain may have been parallel, his installation on a new hill having, in addition, involved a change of name. Later we shall see that there are other reasons for thinking that an organic triad, Jupiter-Mars-Quirinus, presided from the beginning over Latin society in its earliest habitat, during the first *regnum*. This society having gradually annexed all the hills, the worship of its principal divinities may have been distributed at the end of this expansion, with Jupiter taking possession of the Capitol and Quirinus occupying the hill which thenceforth would be named after him, *Quirinalis*. The choice between these opposed explanations of the god, whether fundamentally as an *Ortsgottheit* or as an imported god, will depend on what less external considerations tell us about his nature and his function. At least we have learned that the name of the *collis Quirinalis* does not necessitate the first nor exclude the second.

This reflection, we may say in passing, applies not only to the *collis Quirinalis*; there is no rigid, absolute bond between a cult and the place where it was practiced during the historical era. Although the Regia and the *aedes Vestae* as we know them are in the Forum, we must guard against concluding that the conceptions, rules, and rites which concern them are subsequent to the occupation of the Forum. From the time of the earliest settlement there were surely a *rex* and a Regia, as well as a public hearth. When the Forum had been occupied under adequate conditions of security, the *rex* and the Vestals, the royal house and the hearth, were installed there, bringing with them as a matter of course their particular qualities and their traditional singularities.

7

THE INDO-EUROPEAN HERITAGE AT ROME

The preceding pages have given several examples of the necessity of taking the Indo-European factor into account in the investigation and understanding of the earliest Rome, that is, of comparing Roman facts with the homologous facts of India or Scandinavia, or Ireland or Osssetia. Is this comparison possible? Some make the *a priori* assertion that it is not. Thus Kurt Latte, who is willing to excuse self-deception in the romantics of the nineteenth century, but not in our era (p. 9):

The time which elapsed between the arrival of the Indo-Europeans in the Mediterranean regions and our sources could well appear to be without importance in this epoch [that of Max Müller and Preller], since Homer and the Vedas were dated very early and the Indo-European invasion very late (see the criticism of this opinion in Kretschmer, *Einleitung in die Gesch. d. griech. Sprache*, pp. 76 ff.). They failed to account for the changes which a few centuries can produce in the thought of civilized peoples, and for the cultural influences which dominated the development of the Romans. Today we know how recent our tradition about Rome is.

To clever men who contended that motion was not possible, the philosopher replied by walking toward them. We shall do the same here on the numerous occasions when the comparison with India or Scandinavia will clarify obscure points or exorcise the monsters born from an uncontrolled criticism. But the objection can be destroyed even in its principle.

The oldest Irish traditions are known only in the form which they took in the high Middle Ages; the oldest Eddic poems date from the last centuries of the first millennium of our era, and the bulk of our information comes from Snorri, who lived at the end of the twelfth

and the beginning of the thirteenth century. And yet the comparison of these Western texts with those of the Vedic society, which was older by two thousand years, has produced enlightening results on both sides. I do not speak of my own work or that of my closest friends. Two eminent specialists who were both trained in comparative argumentation, the Celtologist Joseph Vendryes and the Indologist Sylvain Lévi, agree in admiring how not only the *rí* and the *rájan*, the druid and the brahman, but also the forms of epic and court poetry in their respective fields resemble each other and how each contributes to the better understanding of the other. Today Myles Dillon, who is both an Indologist and a Celtologist, analyzes this idea in detail, just as Alwyn and Brinley Rees in Wales do in a fine recent book. Others have shown that the rhetorical character of certain poems of the *Edda* parallels that of the Gathic poems, which are the oldest portions of the *Avesta*. Was Rome, which was known earlier than the British Isles or Iceland, truly so singular that the same kind of comparative investigation cannot be applied to it?

Even more surprising, the religious vocabulary of Rome itself provokes this investigation. In 1918, developing the suggestions of Paul Kretschmer, Vendryes published an article of primary importance in the *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*, entitled "Les correspondances de vocabulaire entre l'indo-iranien et l'italo-celtique."¹ Later scholars have generally dropped the term Italo-Celtic, and the preferred wording today would be "among the Indo-Iranian, Italic, and Celtic languages"—some would even break down the Italic unity—but this does nothing to alter the lesson of these twenty pages, which the author summed up very well in the following terms: "What is striking is that a rather large number of words appear in this list of concepts which are connected with religion, and especially with the liturgy of worship, with sacrifice. Reviewing these words, adding certain others to them, and grouping the whole by categories, one does not merely establish one of the most ancient elements of Italo-Celtic vocabulary; one also establishes the existence of common religious traditions in the languages of India and Iran and in the two Western languages." Vendryes, strictly a linguist and a Voltairean who quickly tired of the observation of religious facts, did not himself measure the import of this eloquent statement. But the statement

stands. It contains purely religious ideas, but also politico-religious, ethico-religious, and juridico-religious ideas, since in those early epochs religion entered every field. I have mentioned above *rex* (Ved. *rđj[an]*, Gaulish *rīg-*), to which very probably should be added the priestly title *flāmen*, masculine in meaning but neuter in form (Ved. *brāhman*, neuter, and *brahmān*, masculine; cf. OPers. *brāzman*, neuter). Several words—and this is a valuable indication of the precocious evolution of Roman thought—passed from the religious to the legal sphere, which was of course colored by religion; yet they retained down to the smallest details the shades of meaning and the fanning-out of uses which occur in Indo-Iranian. Thus *iūs*, which became the word for law but which properly means the full area or measure of action permitted or required (*ius consulis*), corresponds to Vedic *yós*, Avestan *yaoš* “integrity, mystical perfection”;² *crē-dō* and its substantive *fidēs* (apparently modeled on a lost **crēdēs*, whose declension it has taken over) cover, among men, the whole field of relations, between gods and men, that signify the Vedic verb *śrad-dhā-* (Avestan *zraç-dā*) and its substantive *śraddhā* (cf. OIr. *cretim*, Old Welsh infin. *credu*).³ On the boundary of religious meanings (one should think of the quasi-priesthood which is the function of the censor), the same root defines the “qualifying word” which, with a connotation of praise or blame, places a thing, a being, or an idea in its proper relationship with others (Lat. *censeo*, Ved. *śamsati*, Avestan *sañhati*).⁴ Many words which are religious in India are also religious in Rome: *rītus* is related to the important Vedic concept *ṛtā*, Iran. *arta* “cosmic ritual, order, etc., as the basis of truth” (cf. Ved. *ṛtú*, “proper time [for a ritual action], allotted or regulated span of time”; Avestan *ratu*); purity and purification are expressed by the same root, Lat. *purus*, Ved. *pāvate* “he purifies” (participle *pūta* “purified”; Avestan *pūtika*, mythical lake in which the waters are purified); *castus* is from the root of Vedic *śāsti* “he gives instruction” (cf. Avestan *sās-tu* “that he may educate”); *uoueo* is derived from the same root as Ved. *vaghāt* “who offers a sacrifice”; etc.

2. “A propos de latin *jus*,” *RHR* 134 (1947-48): 95-112; reprinted with corrections in *IR*, pt. 1, chap. 1.

3. “QII. 6.” *Coll. Lat.* 44 (*Hommages à L. Herrmann* [1960]: 323-29); reprinted, with extensive changes, in *IR*, pt. 1, chap. 3.

4. *Servius et la Fortune* (1943), pp. 70-98, 188; reprinted, in an abridged form, in *IR*, pt. 1, chap. 5.

At the end of his article Vendryes gave a plausible explanation, in which only a few words must be modified, of the considerable number of equivalences which he had enumerated:

India and Iran on the one hand, Italy and Gaul on the other, preserved in common certain religious traditions, thanks to the fact that these four countries were the only ones in the Indo-European domain to possess colleges (or classes) of priests. Despite striking differences, brahmans, druids, or pontiffs, priests of Vedism or of Zoroastrianism, all have this in common, that they maintained an ancient tradition. These priestly organizations imply a ritual, a liturgy of sacrifice, in short a collection of practices, of those which are usually least adaptable to evolution. . . . But there can be no liturgy or ritual without sacred objects whose names are preserved, without prayers which are repeated unchanged. This accounts for the preservation in the vocabularies of words which could not otherwise be explained.

The existence of powerful priesthoods as preservers of knowledge is indeed striking in the four areas under consideration; but we must not forget that the Germans, who do not seem ever to have known an equivalent system, also preserved, if not a religious vocabulary, at least many religious traditions. As to the content of the traditions, Vendryes's phrase is too restrictive. Religions are not limited to words and actions, to what he calls "an external apparatus"; they include a theology and usually a mythology, an explanation of society and often of the world, an interpretation of the past, the present, and the future. It is this which justifies and supports the words and the actions.⁵

No *a priori* argument can prevail against these evidences provided by vocabulary and what they suggest of preserved traditions and preservative mechanisms. Indo-European is firmly established in its proper place.⁶

5. See the reflections in *Hér.*, pp. 16–17.

6. On the "common Italic" stage, see R. Bloch, "Parenté entre religion de Rome et religion d'Ombrie, thèmes de recherches," *REL* 41 (1964): 119–22; "Réflexions sur le plus ancien droit romain," *Studi in onore di Giuseppe Grosso* 2 (1968): 231–48, esp. pp. 244–47.

8

CONSERVATISM OF ROMAN RELIGION: THE CASE OF THE *IUGES AUSPICIIUM*

The principal reasons for Kurt Latte's skepticism are the rapidity with which a civilized people's religion evolves and the late date of our information about Roman religion. Neither of these reasons has the consequences that he imagines.

The religion of the Romans, of the various categories of the Romans, evolved largely in the last centuries of the Republic. But a notable trait of Roman character in every aspect, and during the most eventful period of Roman history, is its conservatism. The religious changes occurred much more through addition than by internal mutations. This is particularly true of the highest and oldest public priesthods, the trustees of sacred knowledge. I shall return soon to the case of the pontiffs, but, on a higher level, the *rex* and the three *flamens* are a good example of this ultraconservatism. At no point in history do we hear of any of these priests being entrusted with a task different from what he had always done. This has been contested, it is true, with regard to the *flamen* of *Quirinus*. G. Wissowa (p. 155) contended that this priest, having allegedly become idle through the desuetude into which the theology of his god had fallen, was reemployed in the *Consualia*, the *Robigalia*, and the *Larentalia*. This is an arbitrary view, the consequence of a certain conception of *Quirinus*, which is obstructed precisely by the only known duties of his *flamen*; and not only in the innovations but in the losses which it implies, it contradicts the ordinary practice of the Romans. If it is certain that the theology of *Quirinus* was obscured (doubtless later than the hypothesis demands), this would have no automatic effect on the ritual, as

long as his priest still existed. The calendar is filled with rituals—for example, the July festivals—whose meaning was lost but which were still observed. Later we shall examine separately a conception of this god which will not only tolerate but will demand that his flamen serve various divinities in the domain to which the god belongs. Thus this priest does not constitute an exception.¹ On the other hand, the service, the accoutrements, the extremely exacting status, and the honorific position of the best known of the major flamens remained unchanged throughout the republican era and bear the marks of great antiquity. There is no reason to believe that the flamens were more flexible under the kings. In short, these four priests, retained to the end on a level above the *pontifex maximus*, who is nevertheless the true and active presiding official of religious life, are like fossils carefully preserved in their strange form.

As for the augurs and their art, so important in any era, who survived the skepticism and the irony of the time of enlightenment, we have recently acquired proof of what was earlier only recognized as probable; here too there was perfect preservation, absolute conservatism. The augur Cicero obeyed rules which his colleagues in the time of the monarchy had known. This proof, generally unknown (and even ignored), is worth presenting here at some length. In a debate where one always runs the risk of being subjective, it forms a fixed point such as one would like to see more of.

One of the oldest Roman inscriptions² was found in 1899 near the Comitium, on the Lapis Niger; it goes back either to the beginning of the Republic or to the end of the royal period, perhaps even earlier. Nothing of it exists but some fragments which can be read, in boustrophedon writing, on the four faces and on one of the aretes of a rectangular cippus of tufa, or more accurately, on the trunk of this cippus, the only preserved part of it. Because of the impossibility of estimating precisely the length of the periodic lacuna caused by the

1. Below, pp. 156–60.

2. CIL I², 1; Degrassi, *ILLR* 1, no. 3: 4–6. Ejnar Gjerstad, "The Duenos-Vase," *Septentrio-nalia et Orientalia (Mélanges B. Karlgren)*, pp. 133–43, and *Early Rome*, 3 (1960): 161–63, thinks that the inscription on the Quirinal vase is older; I have proposed another interpretation of this text in *Hommages à Marcel Renard* (see also *IR*, pp. 12–25). Another inscription disputes the claims of those of the Forum and the Quirinal to be the oldest in existence; it comes from the Regia, and consists of the word REX, E. Gjerstad, *Early Rome* 3: 300 and fig. 199 (4).

mutilation of the column, it is useless, despite many attempts, to pretend to fill it. What has been preserved, however, is full of substance.³

I a ¹	quoiho . . .
b ²⁻³	. . . sakros : es edsord . . .
II a ⁴⁻⁵	. . . ia . . . ias recei : io . . .
b ⁶⁻⁷	. . . euam quos : re . . .
III a ⁸⁻⁹	. . . m : kalato rem : ha . . .
b ¹⁰⁻¹¹	. . . od : io : uxmen takapia : dotau . . .
IV a ¹²	. . . m : i : te : rp(?)e(?) . . .
b ¹³⁻¹⁴	. . . m : quoiha uelod : neq . . .
c ¹⁵	. . . od : iouestod
V 16	loiuiquiod (q?o??)

The text commences with an execratory formula, protecting the object or the place, transcribed into classical Latin, *quī hu[nc lapidem . . . (or hu[ic lapidi . . .), sacer erit.*

In line 4 we read *recei*, which is the dative *rēgī*, "to the king," or "for the king."

In lines 8–11 we can easily read *-]m calatorem ha[ec? . . . and -]ō (ablative) iūmenta capiat (+ ?).*

In line 12 we may read *-]m iter* followed, for instance, by the preposition *per* or a form of the verb *perficere*; 13 and 14 are at first sight enigmatic; 15, in classical Latin is *-]ō iūstō*; the single word in 16, the first *u* of which is uncertain and which in any case can be read in Latin only as *loiquiod*, is an ablative, surely agreeing with the two immediately preceding ablatives of line 15.

Thus lines 4, 8–9, and 10–11, which mention the *rex*, a *calator*, and, after an ablative in *-ō*, the prescribed action (subjunctive) "*iūmenta capere*," refer to a known situation. In January 1951 I had just finished rereading the *De diuinatione* when, in the course of a visit to the Antiquarium in the Forum, I saw once again the fine cast of the cippus which is displayed there. The most obvious words of the inscription immediately reminded me of a sentence by Cicero which had intrigued me. After my return to Paris it was easy for me to carry this affair to its conclusion, and my article appeared in October of the

3. I transcribe the fragments (distinguished by a, b, c) of each of the four faces and of the arête (roman numerals I–V), indicating the lines (arabic numerals 1–16) and the inter-pointing, and italicizing those letters whose reading is uncertain or seriously contested.

same year in the *Mélanges* presented to Reverend Father Jules Lebreton, under the title "L'inscription archaïque du Forum et Cicéron, *De diuinatione*, II, 36."⁴ The principal elements in the solution of the problem are the following:

1. In this passage (2.[36].77), after recalling a precaution adopted by M. Marcellus for protecting himself against unpleasant auspices, Cicero adds: *huic simile est, quod nos augures praecipimus, ne iuge(s) auspicium obueniat, ut iumenta iubeant diiungere*, "likewise we augurs, to avoid the inopportune occurrence of what is called *iuge(s) auspicium*, prescribe that they order the yoked beast to be removed from the yoke."

2. "They"—who? Evidently the *calatores*, whom the augurs (Suet. *Gramm.* 12), like other priests, had at their disposal for precisely this kind of situation, to give timely directions to the profane to avoid what might pollute and annul the sacred operation (for example, Serv. *Georg.* 1.268; Macr. 1.16.9).

3. Under the monarchy, even if the augurs were differentiated from the *rex* (primitively *rex-augur*?), the *auspicia* were fundamentally a royal affair: "divination, like wisdom, was regarded as *regale*," says Cicero in the same treatise (1.89; see the whole passage).

4. What is the *iuge(s) auspicium*? Paulus (p. 226 L²) defines it: *iuge(s) auspicium est, cum iunctum iumentum stercus fecit*, "there is i.a. when a beast of burden, under the yoke, has let fall excrement." From this we understand the command which the augur Cicero and his colleagues give to their *calatores*: while they are carrying out their duties, engaged in a sacred activity, it is a necessary precaution that every owner of a team of oxen in the near neighborhood of their itinerary be warned to unyoke, to remove his *iuncta iumenta* from the yoke.

5. The place in which the inscription was found is specifically important for one of the known functions of the augurs. Varro (*L.L.* 5.47), explaining the name of the *Sacra Via* which runs the length of

4. In *Recherches de science religieuse* 39 (1951): 17-29; "Le *iuges auspicium* et les incongruités du taureau attelé de Mudgala," *Nouvelle Clio* 5 (1953): 249-66; "Sur l'inscription du Lapis Niger," *REL* 36 (1958): 109-11, and 37 (1959): 102. Those critics who have been willing to examine this comparison have approved it, even, for the essential part and the only one which matters here (*calatorem . . . iumenta capiat*), the most respected of them, Michel Lejeune, whose objections and propositions I have examined in *Hommages à Jean Bayet* (Coll. Lat., vol. 70), pp. 172-79. [See below, p. 88, the end of note 7.]

the Forum and ends at the Capitol, says that it is by this route that the augurs, *ex arce profecti, solent inaugurare*. Was this a case, as Bouché-Leclercq supposed, of a periodic (springtime?) renewal of the *inauguratio* of all the *templa*, starting with the *auguraculum* of the citadel? The circumstances do not matter very much: Varro attests that the augurs, leaving for a certain augural activity, descended from the Capitol to the Forum and turned into the Sacra Via. During their passage they naturally had to avoid any encounter with a *iuge(s) auspicium*, and, in their descent from the hill to the Forum, the *first* transverse road that they crossed, where the troublesome accident might *first* occur, is just called *uicus iugarius*, a name which is well explained by reference to the risk and the regulation which concern us here.⁵ And the Comitium, the place where the ancient inscription was found, is so close to the left side of this crossroad that it seems natural for it to have been located there, at the logical point, as a warning to passersby of the urgent command which the *calator* of the augur might have to give them.

Is it necessary to emphasize how the various elements of this event agree with lines 4, 8-9, and 10-11 of the inscription? In 4-5 and 6-7 what adjoins the dative *rēgi* is too mutilated to be of much help in reconstructing a reading, but *rēgi* itself is clear; 8-9 may be, for example (... the augur acting for the king or the king-augur) [... *iubet suu[m] calātōrem ha[ec *calāre]*, and 10-11 may be [... *iug]ō* (or ... *subiugi]ō*, or [... *iugari]ō*?) *iūmenta capiat*, meaning "let him remove (doubtless with a separate particle, *ex* or *de*, before the ablative)⁶ the yoked beasts from the [yoke . . .]"; moreover, line 12 can be accommodated very easily to such a command, and might be read [... *ut augur* (or *rex*) *sacru[m] iter pe[r]ficere possit . . .*].

The last four lines can also be explained in this context,⁷ although certain critics, while accepting the interpretation of lines 8-11 in

5. See Lugli, *RA*, pp. 78, 89, 124; Platner, *TD*, p. 574, stresses that primitively the *uicus iugarius* was a part of the "original trade route" toward Tiber. The explanation of *iugarius* by the cult of Juno Iuga, scarcely attested elsewhere, seems to be an etymological play on words.

6. Plausible in this stage of the language and corresponding to Homer (*Od.* 9. 416) ἀπό μὲν λίθον εἴλε θυράων, with the verb corresponding to *capere*.

7. I argue from the facts that *iustum* and *liquidum* (three examples in Plautus) are technical qualifications of the auspices: "regular, correctly taken," and "favorable"; that the first form of classical *aluus*, "belly," and also "excrements" (already in Cato), was **aulos* (which Max Niedermann and, following him, F. Muller Jzn and J. B. Hofmann write **uu(c)los*, on the basis of a Lithuanian doublet); that *h*, in *quoihauclo*d, may be the mark of

terms of the *iuges auspicium*, maintain that the inscription deals with several matters, and especially that the subject matter at the end is quite different from that in the middle. I prefer to hold with what is not contested, the lesson of which is sufficiently clear. With regard to a precise regulation, which implies an entire theory of the mystic significance of the yoke and of excrement, an organization of the priesthood (with *calatores*), and a regular itinerary, we may rest assured that for four and possibly five centuries the augural technique did not change any more than the language in which it was expressed. Even if Cicero and his colleagues deplored the forgetting of numerous points of their science, they still preserved valuable fragments of it, which had been transmitted unchanged from the origins to their times.

The augural art was certainly not an exception. The great priest-hoods and the great colleges had their own traditions and rules, neither of which could have been more subject to change than those of the augurs. "Today we know how recent our tradition about Rome is." True, but what does it matter, if, in the last century of the Republic, the augurs and priests were still faithfully repeating the words and actions of royal times?

hiatus that it is, for example, in *ahēn(e)us*, epigr. *huhic* (that is, dissyllabic *huic*; and I propose (lines 13-16):

... *quia, descendā* (or *redditā*) *tunc iunctōrum iūmentōrum* *m cui aluō, neq[ui]ret* (... indication of the religious operation in progress ...) *auspici]ō iustō *liquidō(?)que*).

In 13 the *h*, indicating a hiatus in a group graphically treated as a single word, obliges one (this would be its justification) to read what precedes it with a final vowel, *quōii* (the inscription does not repeat similar letters), that is, *quōii*, the dative of *quōi*; if *quōiei* is the old dative, and as such attested even later, of the stressed relative pronoun, we may imagine that in the enclitic indefinite pronoun (not yet supported by *ali-*), the dative had been precociously reduced to *quōii*. As for the *e* in *auelod*, it may be an irrational vowel, and its vocalism (*e*, not *o*) suggests that we regard it as such (cf. *numerus*, *umerus* from **nom-ḡo-*, **om-ḡo-*). The word whose form is closest to **aulo-* is the given name *Aulus*; now, the Etruscan original is written *Avle* and *Avle*. Finally, for *loi(u)quiod*, see my 1951 article (n. 4 above), p. 28, n. 34; one thinks of an archaic form of a type for which there are examples: cf. *Lūcius*, the given name, and *lūcidus*, *flūuius* (subst.), and *flūuidus* (Lucretius), *Liuius* the proper name, and *liuidus*; it is also thinkable that the engraver might have lost his way in a word where so many letters are repeated in pairs. **loi(u)qu(i)dōd*—in which the vocalism *oi* instead of *i* (whence *liquidus*) might be explained by the influence of following **qu*; in any case, we must explain the word by means of Latin. [Correction note: A new interpretation by Robert E. A. Palmer, "The King and the Comitium: A Study of Rome's Oldest Public Document," *Historia-Einzelschriften* 11 (1969), meets a lot of insuperable difficulties. In the main fragment, l. 11, *kapia* would be the plural of **cape*, an unattested and unlikely variant of *caput*, and *iouxmenta kapia* would mean "*iūmentōrum* (!) *capita*, teams of animals." The last word would be an adjective derived from **louquo-* "*lūcus*," which never existed with *qu*. Etc.]

THE VALUE OF FORMULARY EVIDENCE

The observations in the preceding chapter apply as well to another kind of valuable document, which some scholars have likewise tried to downgrade.

From what has been said at the beginning of these remarks about the value of the annalistic tradition and genre, and about the limits of verification which archaeology allows, it appears that all we can keep from the "historical" accounts, from the end of the royal period up to the Gallic catastrophe, are the approximate dates and certain circumstances concerning the foundation of cults and sanctuaries. The temple of the Capitoline triad and its plebeian, almost contemporaneous counterpart, the temple of the triad Ceres Liber Libera, the *euocatio* of the Juno of Veii and her installation on the Aventine, correspond in time approximately to the dates and roughly to the events recounted by Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus. In detail, however, the fable reasserts its rights. What are we to gather, except for ideology, from the exauguration of Terminus, from the exhumation of the *caput humanum*, from the conflict of the consuls over consecration? The consultation of the Sibylline Books before the establishment of the temple of Ceres, the embassy to Delphi, and the entire marvelous nature of the war with Veii are more than suspect. Much later even, during the Samnite wars, if we can believe that the precise list of offerings made in 296 by the patrician magistrates to Jupiter, Mars, and the Twins, and by the plebeians to Ceres, is genuine, yet in the following year, on the battlefield of Sentinum, we revert to legend or, if you will, to epic, when each of these gods (with Tellus replacing Ceres) repays his obligation by intervening in a specific way in the hard-won victory of the Romans.

But especially in Livy, and above all in the first books, one reads ritual formulas, some of them long and detailed, which the historian presents as authentic. What are they worth? "Prudence is particularly necessary," writes Latte, "when it is a question of utilizing the documents inserted into the annalistic tradition. In essence they were fabricated by the historian himself, or by the model from whom he borrowed directly, with the aid of religious or juridical formulas intended to impart an archaic flavor." And this judgment is motivated in a note (p. 5), as follows:

Mommsen, *Röm. F.*, 2, p. 419, has given a fundamentally just appraisal of this kind of extract from the archives. The description of the ritual of the Fetiales in Liv. 1.32. 6 presents as its concept-subject a personified *Fas* which is impossible in the ancient language, as is the grecized vocative *populus Albanus* (Wackernagel, *Antike Anredeformen*, p. 16). The *foedus* of Liv. 1.24.7 borrows the formula *tabulis ceraue* from the testament (for example, Gaius 2.104), where it refers to the distinction between the will and the codicil. The formula of the *deuotio*, Liv. 8.9.6, contains the phrase *ueniam fero*, attested in all the manuscripts, which contradicts the meaning of "grace, manifestation of favor," which is the only meaning that the word has in religious language (despite Conway, *rem. ad. loc.*; see below, p. 183, n. 4); the same formula is the only text which juxtaposes the *Diui Nouensiles* and the *Di Indigetes* (in that order!), which Livy evidently understood as the new gods and the anciently established gods.

This discussion begins by confusing two questions, two entirely distinct matters: on the one hand, the acts relating to a particular event, set forth just once for a single occasion; on the other hand, the formulas used by competent specialist priests every time there was need for them. Mommsen's criticism, in the study just cited, bears exclusively on the former.¹ It is concerned with the parts of a lawsuit: "The two tribunician decrees in the suit of intercession, which one reads of in Aulus Gellius, 6 (7).19, and which he borrowed from the ancient Annals, are without doubt to be placed on the same plane as the discourses, letters, and extracts from archives that one finds in

1. *Römische Forschungen* 2 (1879): 417-510: "Die Scipionenprozesse," reprinted from *Hermes* (1866), pp. 417-32 ("die Quellen"). Among these sources, to the number of eight, Mommsen first treats the archives of the lawsuit, and begins a convincing demonstration in these terms: "Wirkliche Actenstücke aus diesen Verhandlungen oder nachweislich aus solchen geflossene Angaben besitzen wir nicht." At no time the permanent formulas of the *ius pontificale* or *fetiale*, or of any *ius*, are alluded to.

such great numbers in the old historical works. They are not false, but merely presentations of materials which the author puts in the mouths of the persons involved." This is very well said, and it is moderate. Still, one should not generalize. In a single case, that of the *senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus*, we are able to compare the original version of a long public act of this type with the résumé of it which Livy presents (39.18). The historian comes out of this test with honor.

The formulas of the *ius fetiale* and the *deuotio* are an entirely different matter. This is no longer literature. Livy quotes them for their picturesque and archaic qualities. What reason could he have for changing them? On the contrary, elegance here consists of strict fidelity to unusual texts, which the priests of his time certainly still knew. The internal criticism which attempts to invalidate these pieces of evidence is improper, as it is easy to prove in every case.

1. The fetial who goes abroad to demand reparation in the name of the Roman people covers his head with the *filum*, a woollen veil; halting at the frontier (*fines*), he declares (Liv. 1.32.6): "*Audi, Iuppiter, audite fines* [specifying the frontiers of whatever people are involved], *audiat fas*. *Ego sum publicus nuntius populi Romani; iuste pieque legatus uenio, uerbisque meis fides sit.*" The priest thus calls to witness his qualifications the god who guarantees justice, the place where he himself is located, and that which is the foundation, the very principle of his mission, the mystical basis (*fas*) of all human relations and contracts (*ius*). This third invocation is particularly appropriate if, as is probable, *fas* is an archaic derivative from the root **dhē-* "to place," from which the name of the *fētialis* is also taken.² The action of this priest, the **fēti-* (a word which would have developed into **fētiō*, *-ōnis*, if it had survived), consists in "placing" the mystical basis, *fas*, for every external action of the Roman people, whether in war or peace. Whatever its etymology may be, however, it is by virtue of an *a priori*, primitivist, infantilist conception of ancient Roman religion and thought that the personification of this *fas* has been declared impossible; moreover, it cannot be isolated from the personification of *fines*, which precedes it.³ The earliest Romans were certainly capable of this personifying effort, they who had already animated and

2. Below, pp. 131-32 and 589.

3. And which carries a shade of meaning: *audite fines*, but *audiat fas*.

embodied in two kinds of priests the neuter *flamen* and the neuter *augur*, and who were soon to personify and feminize the neuter *uenus*, side by side with such old feminine entities as *Ops*, and in a much more permanent way than *fas*.

2. The fetial who sanctions a treaty reads its clauses and declares (Liv. 1.24.7—for it is here, and not at 1.32.6, that we find the nominative *populus Albanus*): “*Audi, Juppiter; audi pater patratre populi Albani; audi tu, populus Albanus. Ut illa palam prima postrema ex illis tabulis ceraue recitata sunt sine dolo malo, utique ea his hodie rectissime intellecta sunt, illis legibus populus Romanus prior non deficiet.*” This formula, we are told, betrays itself as a forgery at two points.

First, *populus Albanus* is supposed to be a “Greek vocative.” Why? The only vocative of the sentence is *tu*; *populus Albanus* is a nominative in apposition, almost in parentheses, equivalent to a relative clause: “you, who are the Alban people and no other,” “you, and I specify, particularly, the Alban people.” This nominative of specification is one of the precautions which characterize the formula (*prima postrema, illis tabulis, hic hodie*). Just as the fetial, after declaring *audite fines* in the formula at 1.32.6 must specify whose frontiers (*cuiuscumque gentis sunt nominat*, says Livy parenthetically, after *fines*); just as he has not been content here with saying *audi pater patratre*; but has specified *audi pater patratre populi Albani*, so finally, after saying *audi tu*, he specifies the content of this *tu*, but he does not do so by a vocative which would simply duplicate the pronoun; he uses a nominative which defines it. Do we know enough about Latin before Plautus to deny it the possibility of this nuance?

The expression *tabulis ceraue* is supposed to be a gross error, taken from a late formula of testamentary law. In fact Gaius says (2.104): *deinde testator tabulas testamenti tenens ita dicit: “Haec ita, ut in his tabulis cerisque scripta sunt, ita do, ita lego, ita testor, itaque uos, Quirites, testimonium mihi perhibetote.”* Are we to understand by the words *tabulis cerisque* the body of the will and the codicil? This is not the unanimous opinion. In the last edition of his *Manuel de droit romain* (1 [1945]: 460), R. Monier admits a hendiadys and translates, “In conformity with the bequests written on these tablets of wax . . .” But let us accept Latte’s interpretation. In any case the formula of the fetial says something else: not *cerisque* but, contrasting the two materials, *ceraue*, which may be understood in two ways. Either

ceraue is a parenthesis of the formulary, with either one word or the other, *tabulis* or *cera*, having to be used by the fœtal, depending on whether the agreement which he sanctions has been engraved on bare tablets (of stone or metal) or on wooden tablets coated with wax; or, and I prefer this interpretation, the two words *tabulis ceraue* together form part of a unitary text and refer only to the wooden tablets coated with wax. *Ceraue* then constitutes a precaution against a trick of interpretation, against any mental reservation: *ut illa . . . ex illis tabulis ceraue recitata sunt* means "These clauses, as they have been read from these tablets, or, if you prefer, from the wax which is on them"; thus the contracting parties will not have a loophole, will not be able to pretend that nothing has been read from the tablets in the strict sense, that is, from the wood of the tablets. Is it not a precaution of this kind, involving not its material support but the wording of the text, which is contained in the next clause, *utique ea hic hodie rectissime intellecta sunt*? In both hypotheses, there is nothing in common between the cumulative formula (*cerisque*) of the testator and the alternative formula (*ceraue*) of the fœtal but the principal writing materials, which were as commonly used under the Republic as they were under the emperors. If the compilers of both formulas referred, in two very different circumstances, to the dual nature of the tablet and the wax, it was because nobody could manage without taking account of this duality, regardless of what he had to write.

3. The Roman general who vows himself and the enemy army to the Manes and to Earth recites a formula dictated to him by the grand pontiff (Liv. 8.9.6): "*Jane, Juppiter, Mars pater, Quirine, Bellona, Lares, diui Nouensiles, dii Indigetes, diui quorum est potestas nostrorum hostiumque, diique Manes, uos precor ueneror ueniam peto feroque, uti populo Romano Quiritium uim uictoriamque prosperetis hostesque populi Romani Quiritium terrore formidine morte afficiatis. Sicut uerbis nuncupaui, ita pro Republica Quiritium exercitu legionibus auxiliis populi Quiritium, legiones auxiliaque hostium mecum diis Manibus Tellurique uoueo.*"

This text is particularly important for the study of Roman religion, for it contains a formulary attestation to the triad of the gods of the major flamens, Jupiter, Mars, and Quirinus. We shall have to consider it from this point of view and interpret the joint invocation to

these three gods. Let us save these for our later consideration and merely affirm here that the presence of all the others can be justified without difficulty. In conformity with a known rule, Janus opens an invocation addressed to several gods; Bellona is in her proper place at the decisive moment of the *bellum*; the Lares are the patrons of every portion of the soil which is concerned in human activity, and we have to do here probably with the Lares of the battlefield rather than those of Rome; the Manes are, with Tellus, the recipients of the offering; while of the collective references, one (*Nouensiles*, *Indigetes*) sums up all of the Roman gods, the other all the gods who are concerned with one or the other army. As for the prayer and the vow (*uti*, etc.; *sicut*, etc.), with their specifications, their precisions, and the antithetical symmetry of that which concerns the Romans and that which concerns their enemies, they conform to a type of which there are other Roman examples but which is best illustrated by the incontestably authentic Umbrian ritual of Iguvium.⁴ Nothing in all this is suspicious. But Latte claims to see two errors of wording that prove forgery.

First, the use of *uenia* in *ueniam fero*: in this context, Latte says, *uenia* does not have the meaning of "Gnade, Gunstbezeugung," which is the only admissible meaning in religious language. This comment seems to rest on an erroneous interpretation of *fero*, and primarily on an alteration of the text, which does not say *ueniam fero*, but *ueniam peto feroque*.

As Robert Schilling has shown,⁵ it is true that *uenia*, the divine correlative of **uenus*, of human *ueneratio* toward the god, designates only the favorable inclination of the god toward the man, the grace of the god. Actually in this instance the word does not have a different meaning. In the extraordinarily violent and hasty procedure of the *deuotio*, the suppliant is unwilling to doubt that the gods hear him, and expects his own death within a few minutes as the only sign of their acceptance. While paying beforehand in a transaction which cannot, which must not be a fool's bargain, he says not merely, "I demand your acceptance, your favor," but, "I demand and I gain, I obtain, I am sure of, your acceptance, your favor." *Ferre* here has the meaning which it often has in all the epochs of Latinity: "to

4. See "QII. 9," *Lat. 20* (1961): 253-57 (esp. p. 254).

5. Below, p. 421, n. 26.

gather in, to reap, to receive an advantage, a reward, a profit." The exceptionally compelling circumstance of the *deuotio* was the only one in which this claim could accompany the prayer. In the *euocatio*, for example (Macr. 3.9.7), there is less pressure on the suppliant and the gods, and that which is offered does not have the dramatic quality of the offering in the *deuotio*; also, the phrase *peto feroque* does not occur there: *precor uenerorque ueniamque a uobis peto ut uos populum ciuitatemque Carthaginiensem deseratis*.

The joint mention of the *diui Nouensiles* and the *dii Indigetes* is no cause for suspicion. If one were to call in question everything at Rome which is attested only once, how many details would we lose which for other reasons we should wish to preserve and which all the authors, including Latte, do in fact preserve!⁶ As for the order in which they appear here, it inspires confidence rather than suspicion. If the true meaning of this classification of the gods is not yet clarified, it is at least certain, as Latte says, that Livy and his contemporaries, and some great scholars, made an approximate explanation by means of the pun *indigetes* = *indigenae*, and recognized in the other term a combination, linguistically quite improbable, of *nouus* and *insidere*. If Livy or the annalists who preceded him had invented or retouched the formula of the *deuotio*, why could they not have begun with the "indigenous gods" and put the "naturalized gods" in second place? On the contrary, the formula of the *deuotio* is justified, whatever the meaning of *nouensiles* may be, if the *indigetes* were the subordinate gods, as is suggested by the relationship of their name to *indigitamenta*, the word for the lists of minor gods without a special priest, who are, as we have seen, like the *familia* of certain "great" gods.⁷ Of this Livy was not aware, and yet he presents the gods in the order in which this ancient doctrine named them, and which contradicts his own. Is it

6. Moreover it is not true that this is the only joint mention of the *Indigetes* and the *Nouensiles*. The prayer which ends the *Metamorphoses* (15.861-70) and in which Ovid is obviously inspired by a model, or at least by a formulary type, begins with a paraphrase of *Nouensiles* (naturally in the meaning of "imported gods"), and a direct mention of the *Indigetes*:

*Di precor, Aeneae comites quibus ensis et ignis
cesserunt, dique Indigetes . . .*

The gods who are then named are Quirinus, Mars, and, after gods of the prince (*Penates caesarei*, *Vesta caesarea*, *Phoebus domesticus*), Jupiter. Finally there occurs the generalizing phrase, which must also gloss a ritual formula: *quosque alios uati fas appellare piumque*.

7. See above, pp. 37-38.

not because he respects, down to this detail, a list which he is copying?

From these three tests too, Livy emerges with honor. "Die philologische Kritik des Materials" is a necessary thing, to be sure, but it is not a sound practice to decide in advance that it will be used only and at any price for destructive purposes.

THE ROMAN SCHOLARS

The interpretation of the inscription in the Forum and the preceding considerations suggest that we do not regard the antiquaries of the last years of the Republic and the beginning of the Empire with permanent suspicion. In default of Cato and a number of others whose work is lost, this means Varro and Verrius Flaccus. It is from Varro that Ovid derives the bulk of his information in the *Fasti*. We know of the work of Verrius Flaccus through the abridgment of it which Festus made, while for the parts of Festus which are lost we have the abridgment of his abridgment made by Paulus Diaconus. Not to mention Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Plutarch, Servius, the wordy commentator on Virgil and his interpolator, Aulus Gellius, Macrobius, and the Fathers of the Church rely on these antiquaries, as well as all the scholars of imperial Rome and, later, of Byzantium. It is fashionable today to depreciate these great workers.¹ In particular the systematic Sabinism of Varro, his false etymologies, his Greek culture, and his philosophical interpretations are thought to mar his work to the point of rendering it almost useless. This is unfair. Each of these weaknesses has had only limited effects. The excesses of Sabinism are apparent only in certain passages of his *De lingua latina*, and if many of his proposed etymologies cannot be retained, many others are valid; moreover, it is always easy to see and to set aside those which are based on faulty analyses of common or proper nouns. As for the results of his familiarity with Greek thought and of his Stoicism, they are lessened and, as it were, controlled by the nature and scope of the studies which he undertook.²

1. Bibliography in Latte's notes, pp. 5-7.

2. A good restatement in J. Collart, "Le sabinisme de Varron," *REL* 30 (1952): 69-70; by the same author, *Varron, grammairien latin* (1954). L. Gerschel, "Varron logicien," *Lat.* 17 (1958): 65-72, shows that Varro occasionally used very archaic classifications, doubtless preserved in pontifical science.

Before his sufferings in the Social War, the *pontifex maximus* Q. Mucius Scaevola, a man of great intellect, had reduced to order the then highly disorganized Roman religious conceptions.³ From what remains of Ennius, we see clearly enough the intoxication, and then the confusion, into which knowledge of Greek literature—mythology, philosophy, and criticism—had plunged the cultivated, patriotic, and pious Romans. What contradictions! While Jupiter continued to display his magnificent power and fidelity in the beautiful lines of the first national epic, the innumerable, often scandalous, fables which were told about his Greek counterpart reached Rome along with the literature, and the common people were entertained by the elaborate and prolonged affair which he brought to a happy conclusion in the home of the general Amphitruo. In the same era Ennius's translation of Euhemerus portrayed this god as a man, a deified king of ancient times, and learned natural philosophers taught that he and his adventures were nothing but an expression of the air and its phenomena. Though not even compatible with each other, each of these attitudes toward the great god had many things in its favor. The steady growth of Rome was itself proof of the existence of the Capitoline god; the charm and the abundance of his myths attracted men of taste to the Olympian king; the prestige of science and the facility of dialectic held men in a kind of equilibrium between skepticism and symbolic interpretation. How was all this to be harmonized? A born conciliator, an empiricist like every good Roman, and well informed about Greek matters, Mucius Scaevola understood how to make an original use of the ideas of the Stoics concerning the diverse sources of knowledge about the gods.⁴ Thus, by abstracting the classification which best suited his materials and separating the elements of a too rapid and uncontrolled fusion, he preserved, in one of the cells of his partitioning, the originality and the dignity of the genuine Roman tradition. As Saint Augustine says, he distinguished the gods introduced by the poets, the gods introduced by the philosophers, and the gods introduced by the statesmen (*Ciu. D.* 4.27). It was Varro who perfected this happy division, which answered the

3. G. Lepointe, *Q. Mucius Scaevola, sa vie et son oeuvre juridique, ses doctrines sur le droit pontifical* (1926); born about 140, he died at the age of fifty-eight.

4. P. Boyancé, "Sur la théologie de Varron," *REA* 57 (1955): 57-84 (on the Stoics, Mucius and Varro, pp. 58-67). J. Pepin, "La théologie tripartite de Varron," *Revue des études augustinienes* 2 (1956): 265-94.

needs of the times. Since the same divine names could figure in all three rubrics, he proposed a mythical theology appropriate to the theater, a physical or natural theology appropriate to the world of nature, and a civil theology appropriate to the city. For each of these he provides an excellent definition (*ibid.* 6.5):

... "The first kind that I named," Varro says next, "has much fiction that is inconsistent with the dignity and true nature of immortal beings. In such fiction, for instance, we are told how one god sprang from the head, another from the thigh, another from drops of blood; and again how gods have been thieves, adulterers or slaves of a man. In short, in this theology everything is ascribed to the gods that can befall a man, even the very lowest man." ...

... "The second kind of theology that I have pointed out," he says, "is the subject of many books that philosophers have bequeathed to us, in which they set forth what gods there are, where they are, what their origin is and what their nature, that is, whether they are born at a certain time or have always existed, whether they are of fire as Heraclitus believes, or of numbers as Pythagoras thinks, or of atoms as Epicurus says. And there are many other such points, which our ears can endure to hear better within the walls of a school than outside in the forum." ...

... "The third kind," he says, "is that which citizens in the states, and especially the priests, have an obligation to learn and carry out. It tells us what gods are to be worshipped by the state and what rites and sacrifices individuals should perform." ...

It is hard to believe that the man who formulated these distinctions and so neatly contrasted the third theology with the first two was not capable, in his remarks on Jupiter, of distinguishing that which came from Homer or from the Porticus or from the Academy from what the pontifical tradition supplied. The lively attacks of Saint Augustine in the subsequent chapters, and his denunciation of the state of confusion between the first and the third kinds of theology, are offered more in the spirit of polemic than in good faith. This, for instance (6.7.1):

... What idea of Jupiter did those men have who put his nurse in the Capitol? Did they not give evidence in support of Euhemerus who wrote, not as a garrulous story-teller, but as a careful historian, that all such gods had once been men, and subject to death? Men have also given the "feasting gods" [*epulones deos*] a place at the table of Jupiter as his parasites. What else did they intend except that the sacred rites should agree with the mimes? If a mime

had said that they were parasites of Jupiter invited to dine with him, he would obviously seem to have been trying to get a laugh. But Varro said it, and said it not in a context of mockery, but of favourable comment on the gods.

After making allowance for Augustine's indignation, what is left of his remarks? We understand that Varro, in his discussion of the Capitoline temple, described a portrayal of the she-goat Amalthea among the other objets d'art there, and also that he spoke (how one would love to read the information he gave in this passage!) of the *epula Jouis* and of the *lectisternia* which took place there. A little later on, Saint Augustine reproaches Varro, in connection with his discussion of the Larentalia and its application to civil theology, for having placed in a discussion of "civil theology" about the Larentalia the story which we have summed up above⁵ concerning the Herculean wedding night of the courtesan Larentina—and which the Christian polemist finds at most worthy of "mythical theology." Here, on the contrary, we are grateful to Varro for having separated the Roman fables of all eras, the Roman explanations, whether ancient or not, of the national festivals from the Greek legends, the matter for his "mythical theology," and for having welcomed them in his "civil theology." Was it not from him that Ovid, Plutarch, and others whom we still read took them?

We must certainly weigh the testimony of Varro, as of all others, and on the whole it is easy, thanks to the general lines of his system. But we must also be ready to accept his teaching when there is no specific reason to doubt it. I am thinking of the admirable definition which he gives (Aug. *Ciu. D.* 7.9) of the conceptual opposition between Janus and Jupiter. He cannot have taken this from the Greek philosophers, since the Romans had given up the attempt to find a counterpart to their original Janus in Greece; moreover, he provided it to explain a ritual action: in the enumeration of the gods, Jupiter is named in second place, after Janus. Why?

Because the beginnings [*prima*] are in the power of Janus, and the summits [*summa*] in that of Jupiter. So Jupiter is rightly regarded as king of all. For beginnings are inferior to summits, since, though they precede in time, they are surpassed in dignity by the summits.

5. Above, p. 57.

The primitivist prejudice has prevented many contemporary authors from admitting a god of beginnings in early Rome, a god uniquely defined by his position in all the *prima*. Thus Janus becomes inexplicable, or becomes the victim of acrobatic explanations. Why refuse to accept as ancient this brief and substantial fragment of the pontifical catechism, which explains everything?

Apart from the antiquaries, what we have learned regarding the inscription on the Lapis Niger, the long preservation of the ritual which it mentions, no longer allows us to disregard the technical compilations which, under the name of treatises *de auspiciis*, *de religionibus*, etc., paved the way for the treatises *de iure pontificio* of two contemporaries of Augustus, Antistius Labeo and Ateius Capito. Lost but often quoted by the scholarly and unintelligent Byzantine monk Johannes Lydus, they put into circulation exact information which, without them, would have disappeared along with the priest-hoods.

III

THE SO-CALLED PONTIFICAL REVOLUTION

In the preceding pages there has been frequent mention of pontifical science and pontifical tradition. But the interpretation of these words again gives rise to wide divergences. Which pontiffs are we talking about, or rather, the pontiffs of which period? Must we believe that there was what has been called a revolution—as Latte says (p. 195), “the revolution which carried the *pontifex maximus* and the college subordinate to him to the head of Rome’s religious organization”—and in what period did it take place? Latte, who bases his entire interpretation of archaic Roman religion on this revolution, recognizes that it has left no trace in the writings of the annalists, who did not fail to recount many struggles of less importance; he sees in this silence a reason for doubting, not the revolution which he conjectures, but the “historical pseudo-tradition concerning archaic Rome.” By analogy with what Greece offers, he thinks that the *rex*, after having occupied his natural place at the head of religious life, “an der Spitze des Sacralwesens,” must have maintained his position there for a certain time after the abolition of the political monarchy, when he found himself reduced to the role of *rex sacrorum*, and that a radical change was needed to dispossess him to the advantage of the *pontifex*. What happened?

One cannot imagine that the King of Sacrifices should one fine day have peaceably renounced the control of religion in favor of the Pontifex; it is even less imaginable since nothing, apparently, in the attributions of the “roadmakers” suggests the central position taken by the pontifical college. The energetic desire for power on the part of individual bearers of the title must have eventually won out through more or less protracted conflicts [pp. 195–96].

In what period are we to date the victorious conclusion of these conflicts? They must have provoked certain upheavals within the patriciate and the state, but the tradition, so verbose when it discusses the first confrontations of the plebs and the patriciate, does not breathe a word about them. J. B. Carter, who was Latte's forerunner on this path, thought himself justified in dating them as late as 260 B.C., but this was on the basis of a slight and improperly interpreted clue, which is no longer regarded as acceptable. Thus we can now rely only on evaluations of probability, for instance on an examination of the *ordo sacerdotum*, which, we are told, must have been established after the victory of the *pontifex* over the *rex*, even though the *rex* always holds the first place of honor in it. This list names as the five chief priests of the state, first the *rex sacrorum*, then, in hierarchical order, the *flamen Dialis*, the *flamen Martialis*, the *flamen Quirinalis*, and in fifth position, the *pontifex*. Now, there were fifteen flamens among whom the religious reformers might choose; they kept none of the so-called minor twelve, who were principally concerned with rural affairs, but only those three "who had some importance for the community." Is not this a presumption that the victory and the reform took place at a time when the preponderance of the *urbs* over the *ager* had been achieved? A more important presumption: among the three flamens thus selected there figures the one who officiates in the cult of the local god of one of the hills, Quirinus; there was nothing to suggest that he would be chosen for this honor so long as he was merely Quirinus: "From this it will be concluded that the identification of Quirinus with the founder of Rome was complete, an identification which can hardly be placed earlier than the second half of the fourth century" (Latte, p. 196). Thus we possess a *terminus a quo*: the pontifical revolution occurred later than 350. It is certainly annoying that the annalistic tradition says nothing about it, for around this time this tradition becomes real history, and a short time later, in the year 300, it will not fail to indicate the less radical changes brought about by the *lex Ogulnia* in the status of the pontiffs (the increase in their number and the opening of the priesthood to plebeians). But the fact is there: Quirinus was not able to win this promotion for his flamen before he himself was promoted to founder.

This rather surprising presentation of the rise of the pontiffs, and of its effects, is explained by the image which Latte offers of the long

beginnings of Roman religion. The plan which he has chosen has obliged him, as frequently happens to him, to parcel out his account; however, we are able to put the fragments together here. First this (p. 23), which seems to make allusion to the alleged revolution, though placing it at an earlier time:

Very early there must have taken place a complete reorganization of the priesthoods, which left no trace in tradition. It cannot be doubted that in ancient times the king had to perform religious rites just as every Roman performed them in his house. . . . From all that we know, in the ancient period the particular priests of various divinities were juxtaposed loosely, each with a well-defined round of duties. During historical times this loose order was replaced by a strict organization, with the Pontifex Maximus at its head.

From this we gain a picture of a totally anarchic state of primitive religion; however, we do not get even a glimpse of what kind of warrant the words "from all that we know" are able to give us. Things are made somewhat plainer further on (pp. 36-37), under the heading "the most ancient couch," as follows: Of Etruscan, and more remotely, Greek origin, the calendar of festivals was introduced to Rome some time around 500, in any case shortly before the establishment of the Capitoline cult, which does not figure in it. The religion to which it bears witness was already far from its original form; some gods had been forgotten, others added. This we know from the list of the fifteen flamens, each of whom serves a particular god and several of whom do not appear in the ferial. Of these we know only twelve, through their accidental occurrence in texts and inscriptions (twelve, and not thirteen, since Latte, for reasons of principle, suspects the *flamen Portunalis*). They are the *Dialis*, the *Martialis*, the *Quirinalis*, the *Volcanalis*, the *Carmentalis*, the *Cerialis*, the *Volturnalis*, the *Palatualis*, the *Furrinalis*, the *Floralis*, the *Falacer*, and the *Pomonalis*. In primitive times these flamens were entirely independent of one another, like their gods. What happened then? Not to do an injustice to the author's thought, I translate his own words:

Of a later hierarchy [of the flamens]—which was perhaps introduced after the organization of the priesthoods . . . we know only that the *Dialis*, the *Martialis*, and the *Quirinalis* were at the head and *Pomona* at the bottom (Festus 154b). The position of the first three is explained by the fact that they

were the only ones whose names, in the historical era, were more than labels (Aug. *Ciu. D.* 2.15 names only them), and for this reason they were included in the pontifical college. We do not even know the names of three of the fifteen. That this list of divinities is more ancient than the ferial is what emerges from the fact that Falacer, Pomona and Flora, who have flamens, do not figure in the ferial. Even if the absence of Flora and Pomona can be explained by the fact that the dates of their festivals were variable and determined by the flowering and ripening of the harvest, there still remain Falacer and the three unknown terms. The memory of Furrina (who had in addition a sanctuary near Satricum, Cic. *Quint. fr.* 3.1.4) was in actual fact preserved only because C. Gracchus met his death in her grove. Since antiquity Voltumnus has been interpreted as a river god, after the river of this name in Campania; but of his festival, the Volturnalia, we know nothing but the name. At the moment when the Pontifex Maximus took over the control of public worship in Rome, the greater number of the priesthoods had become so insignificant that even the attempt to incorporate them into the hierarchy was abandoned. Certainly nobody will pretend to draw a picture of the earliest public religion of Rome on the basis of this list, or maintain that the divinities who do not appear in it (for example, Janus, Genius, Juno, Tellus, the Lares, and the Penates) belonged exclusively to private cults, even at this date. But it is clear that the conditions attested in the festival calendar cannot be considered as the primitive conditions in Rome, still less as the primitive Italic conditions.

This view of the origins could provoke a great many discussions of details, but I wish to keep to the essential point, which consists of two affirmations: the inorganic state of the original religion, and the date and extent of the pontifical revolution. However, two preliminary remarks will be useful.

No one, I believe, has ever argued that the gods of the three major and the twelve minor flamens exhausted the earliest pantheon. The type of priesthood represented by the *flamonium* was doubtless not suited to every type of god. For example, the groups of gods who cannot be easily dissociated, such as the Lares and the Penates, are without flamens; without flamens also, the gods who are multiplied to infinity, one to a person, such as Genius, or whose very specific activity is repeated to infinity by the perpetual recurrence of a single circumstance, such as Janus (*deus omnium initiorum*) and perhaps Juno (considering her character as goddess of all birth), or even Carna (who

presides over the assimilation of food). Tellus is inseparable from Ceres, who has her own flamen, and Vesta possesses her Vestals, who are incompatible with a special masculine priesthood. In each case, there must therefore have been a reason which determined the presence or absence of such a priest, but we do not understand it in each case, for lack of a sufficiently detailed knowledge of the divinity itself. Afterward, as we know, many specialist flamens were created; but they are not involved in the study of the origins.

Neither does anything in the documentation give reason to think that a classification, a unitary hierarchy, ever included the total number of priests and, through them, all the gods. We are informed of an *ordo* of the five highest priests (the *rex*, the three *flamines maiores*, and the *pontifex maximus*: Fest. pp. 299–300 L²) and, on the other hand, of *discrimina maiestatis*, of a hierarchy of *dignationes* among the fifteen flamens, of which the lexicographer gives only the extreme terms (1: *Dialis*—certainly followed by *Martialis* and *Quirinalis*; 15: *Pomonalis*, “*quod Pomona leissimo fructui agrorum praesidet, id est pomis*,” *ibid.* p. 272), but which Ennius probably followed (Varr. *L.L.* 7.45) in his enumeration of the last six (*Volt. Pal. Furr. Flor. Fal. Pom.*). Thus we are aware of two independent classifications, which have nothing in common but the compact group of the three *maiores*.

These specifications allow us better to delineate the two discussions.

1. Latte does not admit any heterogeneity among the fifteen flamens, or between the greater and the lesser. He thinks, on the contrary, that it was in a late development, through an accident of history, that the three greatest flamens were placed, below the *rex*, in the first rank of the priests, but the explanation of this promotion which he offers varies in the course of his book. If the flamens of Jupiter, Mars, and Quirinus were thus honored by the victorious *pontifex*, shortly after 350, it was, as we have read on his page 37, because they were the only ones who had at that time more than a “*titulare Bedeutung*”; on pages 295–96 and 403, it is even by this “*Bedeutung*” on the one hand and by a “*praktische Bedeutungslosigkeit*” on the other that the expressions *flamines maiores* and *flamines minores* are interpreted, a distinction, however, which would not have been definitively established (“*endgültig festgelegt*”) until the time of the Augustan restoration, that is, three centuries after the alleged victory

of the *pontifex* and its consequence, the establishment of the pontifical college and of the *ordo sacerdotum*. But, on page 196, the good fortune of the first three flamens is said to derive from the fact that in the second half of the fourth century the *urbs* had definitively won out over the *ager*, and that the gods of the city were the only ones of interest to the whole of the thus rebalanced society. Starting from humble origins, Jupiter and Mars had already been for some time the principal gods of the state, and the pallid Quirinus, recently taken out of obscurity by his assimilation to the founding hero, had just joined them on this level.

Setting aside what concerns Quirinus, which we shall examine later,¹ the second explanation would certainly be the better one, because it recognizes, around 350, a distinction between the *flamines maiores* and *minores*, in terms not only of vitality but of social foundation and conceptual meaning; but this, too, Latte considers to be produced by the accident of history. In fact, both explanations come up against grave difficulties.

In the first place, in religious nomenclature the articulation *maiores-minores*, where we encounter it, does not contrast merely the more important and the less important; it notes a difference of nature or of status and a hierarchy based on this difference. The magistracies are divided into *maiores* and *minores*, not according to their "importance," but according to whether they have the *ius* of the *auspicia maiora* (*maxima*) or *minora* and, except for the censorship, this division corresponds to that of the magistracies with (*consul*, *praetor*) and without *imperium* (Gell. 13.15, citing the treatise *De auspicis* of Messala; Fest. pp. 274-75 L²);² moreover (Gell. 13.15), the minor magistrates are appointed to their office by the *comitia tributa*, the major magistrates by the *comitia centuriata*. The differentiation of the flamens as *maiores* and *minores* likewise involves distinctive characteristics which certainly do not date from the Augustan restoration or from the fourth century and which have a ritual foundation. Not only is it demanded of the *maiores* alone that they be born *farreati* and married by *confarreatio* (Gaius *Institutionum commentarii* 1.112), but they, and they alone with the *rex*, the augurs, and certain other priests

1. Below, Part I, chap. 5.

2. The *praetor maior* is the *urbanus*, the others are *minores*, Fest. p. 277 L². Naturally we have to consider only the cases in which *maior* and *minor* are explicitly contrasted (for example, the *pontifices minores* are not contrasted with **p. maiores*).

(pontiffs, perhaps *Salii*),³ must be *inaugurati*—for absolutely nothing supports the idea adopted by Latte (p. 403) that all the flamens also had to be *inaugurati*.⁴ Now, the *ius augurale* is essentially conservative, and the augurs remained independent of the pontiffs throughout Roman history; therefore it is improbable that by a decision of the victorious *pontifex* there should have been a policy, beginning around 350, of inaugurating priests who had not previously been inaugurated, or, inversely, of ceasing to inaugurate priests who previously had to undergo this ceremony.

In the second place, the difference between the type of competence which Latte notes (p. 196) is real and fundamental, not accidental as he believes. Those divinities of the minor flamens about whom we know something useful (and this excludes Falacer and Furrina) are either rural and agrarian in their function (Ceres, Flora, Pomona; partly also Volcanus, to judge by the intention of the Volcanalia), or attached either to a type of place (Portunus and the gates; perhaps Voltumnus and the rivers), or to a specific place (Palatua and the Palatine; perhaps Furrina and the Janiculum; cf. in late times the *nymphae Forrinae*, *νυμφές Φορρίνες*,⁵ on this hill; finally, although Carmentis is certainly more complicated, her name suggests that her various functions derive somehow from the powerful but simple notion of the *carmen*. Jupiter, Mars, and Quirinus are of an entirely different order: from the beginning Jupiter, to judge by his flamen, is not only a celestial god, but a royal god, a “rector,” as he is called by other Italic peoples, and the guarantor of human relations; Mars presides over the whole world of war and men in their quality as warriors, between the month which owes its name to him, March, and October; Quirinus, whatever his domain may be, a subject which we shall explore later, bears a name related to *Quirites* and derived from a **co-uirio-* or a **co-uiria-*, which designates an assemblage of men. These three gods, then, share a social interest in mankind as an organized group—whether as subjects, soldiers, or crowd.

3. P. Catalano, *DA*, pp. 211–20, seems to extend too generously the cases of inauguration of the magistrates; Cic. *Leg.* 2.8 does not indicate that *all* of the priesthoods, or even many of them, had been inaugurated; and Dion. 2.22.3 has been pertinently criticized by Mommsen and by others.

4. See also, p. 409, n. 2, the amusing way in which Latte, using the abridger Paulus (p. 330 L²) instead of the more complete original Festus (p. 354 L²), discreetly blurs another difference between *fl. maiores* and *minores* (the privilege of having *calatores*).

5. See references and discussion in Platner, *TD*, p. 318.

But above all, what we have already glimpsed of the Indo-European heritage at Rome, and of the level of that heritage, leads to the conclusion that symmetries, articulations, and classifications existed at the center of the pantheon and of the cult. The divinities of Rome cannot have lived in disordered independence any more than did the Indo-Iranian, Germanic, or Celtic gods.

In particular, the definite connections between the *rex sacrorum* and the *flamen Dialis*⁶ cannot have been produced by the more or less belated decision of a *pontifex*. In the fictional role which has been assigned to him, what interest could he have had in giving sacred assistance to the rival who opposed his ambitions? Nor can one see how any new bond could have been established in republican times between these two priests, who were by then true fossils, immobilized in their singularity. The connection between them must have been preexistent, dating from the time when the *rex* was truly the political leader, and this takes back to the very beginnings the precedence over all the other flamens of the king's sacred associate, the flamen of Jupiter. The *ordo* preserved this precedence for him, rather than conferring it on him.

Likewise, regardless of one's conception of Mars and Quirinus,⁷ it is a fact that they have close ties in all the periods in which Roman religion is observable and in all the forms which the idea of Quirinus assumed. Whether he is called the "Sabine Mars," whether he is seen as the warrior god of the Quirinal duplicating the warrior god of the Palatine, or whether, on the contrary, the articulation *milites-Quirites* (equivalent to *bellum-pax*) is assigned to them, as certain texts suggest, it is a fact that they, and they alone, are celebrated in rituals involving weapons; it is a fact that the teams of *Salii*,⁸ both alike so far as we can determine, were assigned to Mars and Quirinus, and to them alone; and it is a fact that the legend which declares Romulus to be the son of Mars also deifies him as Quirinus. Later we shall attempt to organize these representations, but the mere persistence through so many variations of a particular connection between these two gods is sufficient proof that this connection is part of their nature; thus it cannot be an accident of history if the *flamen Quirinalis* follows the *Martialis* in the *ordo* and, with him, exhausts the list of the *maiores*.

6. Below, pp. 152-53.

7. Below, Part I, chaps. 4 and 5.

8. Below, pp. 146-47 and 275-76.

2. It is not only the total silence of the historians concerning such an important event, and at a time when history comes into existence, which renders Latte's "pontifical revolution" rather improbable. How can one conceive the functioning of religion between 500 and 350, during the long rivalry which he alleges between the *rex* and the *pontifex*? I do not know in what form he imagines the end of the monarchy. As for me, I do not think that after the elimination of the last Etruscan king, however it was brought about, a Latin monarchy was reestablished at Rome, soon to disappear in its turn. The departure of the Etruscans must have been the end of the *regnum*, as the annalistic tradition claims, and the reorganization of public powers, the distribution of the heritage of the *rex*, must have taken place at this moment.⁹ What did this heritage consist of? Of political functions and religious functions.¹⁰

In the former the *rex* was perhaps first replaced by a *iudex* or *praetor* who was elected for life, then for a term, in any case by some kind of patrician leader whose office developed more or less rapidly into those of the supreme magistrates of the republican state, the annual consuls.¹¹ The religious functions were less easily transferable, since the gods took an immediate interest in them. The most delicate part of these functions involved the sacred operations which the king performed directly in his role as political leader, whether in the field of cult or in that of signs. The former, consisting of sacrifices, ceremonies, and monthly proclamations of festivals, were like a ritual routine, the performance of which, while necessary, was sufficient to itself; the latter, consisting of the taking of the auspices, passed into and dominated political action. There was also the mystical articulation, not easily definable but real, between the *rex* and two august priesthoods, the *flamen Dialis* and the chaste Vestal virgins. Finally, there was the direction of the religious life of the state, extending

9. Below, pp. 554-59; according to C. Gioffredi, "Rex, praetores e Pontifices nella evoluzione dal regno al regime consolare," *BCA* 71 (1943-45): 129-35, the pontiffs were not priests, but experts, advisers to the king; it is when the *rex* was reduced to the role of *rex sacrorum* that they became priests, progressively taking over many of his duties. This view is arbitrary.

10. Diverse opinions in: S. Mazzarino, *Dalla monarchia allo stato repubblicano* [1945]; K. Hanell, *Das altrömische eponyme Amt* (1946); U. Coli, *Regnum* (1951); J. G. Préaux, "La sacralité du pouvoir royal à Rome," *Le pouvoir et le sacré, Annales du centre d'étude des religions* 1 (Univ. libre de Bruxelles, Institut de Sociologie Solvay) (1962): 103-21.

11. A. Momigliano, "Praetor Maximus e questioni affini," *Studi in onore di Giuseppe Grosso* 1 (1968): 161-75.

from the general supervision and discipline of worship to the neutralization of prodigies and the appeasement of irritated gods. In these last duties the *rex* acted in collaboration, more operative than mystical, with an original priest, the *pontifex*, either alone or already *maximus*, who was simultaneously a counselor and an auxiliary. The origin of this priesthood is obscure, but it seems always to have had liberty, initiative, and freedom of movement, in contrast with what was required of the *flamen Dialis*, and the two types appear to have balanced each other in the sacred entourage of the *rex*.

After the last reigning *rex*, and there surely must have been one, this vast religious domain could only have been parceled out. Transferred as a whole to the *iudex*, it would have made him merely another *rex* under a new name, and this would have nullified the reform. That function which was least separable from politics, the *auspicia*, passed principally to the magistrate. The scrupulous conservatism which always characterized Roman practice, and which allowed additions to the cult more readily than deletions from it, caused a *rex* to be maintained, though it restricted his duties to the *sacra*, as his name specifies, and reduced him to the status of a priest, since the word *sacra* has no meaning except in and for this position. The *rex* also preserved the ritual element in his relations with the *flamen Dialis* and the *Vestales*, for this was still something unchangeable. *Rex* and *regina*, *flamen* and *flaminica* continued to act together (*a rege petunt et flamine lanas*, Ov. F. 2.21), to sacrifice in the same place, the Regia, and to share insignia and privileges. In the only known fragment of more complex connections, the Vestals continued to approach the king once a year with the words, *uigilasne, rex? uigila!* There remained the active part of the ancient king's religious position. Did it belong first to the *iudex*, whom the *pontifex* would have continued to advise and help, and then pass to this *pontifex* when the duration of the supreme magistracy was reduced to a year, a measure of time hardly compatible with the acquisition and utilization of what was already a difficult science? Or was it the *pontifex* who took it over directly from the very beginning? The fact is that throughout the whole history, it is he, with or without his colleagues, who not only counsels and assists the Senate and the magistrates in religious matters, but who is present at the *comitia calata*, and later presides over the *comitia sacerdotalia*, intervenes in the *confarreatio*, draws up the calendar, "takes" or

appoints, and, in varying forms and degrees, controls the Vestals and the highest priests. And his sphere of activity, even his power, will grow so great that Julius Caesar will covet and, using the dubious means of his era, succeed in assuming the dignity of grand pontiff, and the emperors will finally confiscate it for their own profit.

This view has several advantages. It is logical, it explains all the data in a coherent fashion, with no loose ends or difficulties; it does not oblige us to imagine any struggles, or prolonged and active competitions which have left no trace in written accounts. Finally—though this is the least important factor—it agrees with the annalistic tradition, which is to say, doubtless, with the pontifical tradition itself.

The import of this restoration is considerable. What Latte presents as the effects of his “pontifical revolution”—formalism, casuistry, the development of formulas, and in general the transformation of religion into a meticulous science and technique, the multiplication of omens and *piacula*, etc.—are not novelties of the closing fourth century. They are the very hallmarks of Roman religion, and doubtless were so from its beginning, even if, as seems certain, they were accentuated and confirmed by the passage of time. I doubt that the first of the flamens ever spent his life in the open air in a *lucus* of Jupiter (Latte, p. 203). In his hut on the Palatine, however, he already had to observe the positive and negative obligations which were later to make him such a strange kind of holy man, and which he inherited from remote prehistory.

12

SOME CHARACTERISTICS OF ROMAN RELIGION

Latte, agreeing with general opinion, is right in saying that the calendar of festivals does not give a picture of the earliest religion, or even a complete listing of the cults and gods current at the time when it was established. The study of this calendar, which since Mommsen's time has been almost a specialized field, is important but not dominant. A gift of the Etruscans who were, in this as in so many things, the missionaries of the Greeks, the calendar is a framework imposed on an already largely organized religion. The date of its introduction is uncertain. As no mention is made in it of the Capitoline cult, many think that it was introduced before the establishment of that cult. This is possible; it is even natural to think that it was imported during Rome's Etruscan period, since Etruscan science is its immediate source. But the argument based on the absence of the Capitoline cult is not decisive. "The habit of noting the anniversaries of temple dedications," as J. Bayet says, "may have been introduced rather late, and a political coalition did not have to be inscribed in a list of ritual festivals."¹ There may have been other reasons as well, which we cannot determine. Jupiter does not occupy the position in the calendar which we should expect from his eminent place in religion. The Ides, especially those of September, the *natalis* of the Capitoline temple, which were later occupied by an *epulum Jovis*, and several festivals are placed under his patronage (the Regifugium of 24 February and the Poplifugia of 5 July, which must have formed a politico-religious structure; the three wine festivals of 23 April, 19 August, and 11 October; and the Terminalia, the festival of boundaries, of 23 February). These attribu-

1. *Histoire politique et psychologique de la religion romaine* (1957), p. 94. I make reservations concerning the "political coalition" in this circumstance.

tions are all explained by various aspects of the god's theology, and there is no reason to believe that they are secondary. None of these rites, however, except the most distinctive one—the *ouis* of the Ides regarded as the “summit” of the month—goes to the heart of this theology. Though *rex* and *summus*, Jupiter is less spectacularly served than Mars. But in Vedic India too, is not the cult of the warrior Indra much more highly developed, in breadth if not in depth, than that of Varuṇa and Mitra, the sovereign gods?

Almost all the cults are placed at fixed times of the year, which is thus studded with festivals. This practice, which still exists in the modern West, doubtless began earlier than the introduction of the Etrusco-Greek calendar, which would have done nothing but formalize it. If it seems normal to anyone who is familiar principally with the other classical civilization, that of Greece, it is nonetheless original as compared with the earliest known practice of the Indians, the Germans, and the Irish. In Ireland, sacred and even mythic activity is concentrated around the seasonal feasts of the year, especially around three of them, which overflow with rites and justificatory accounts. In Vedic India, the most important ceremonies are also “complex” ones, apparently agglomerations of rituals of diverse origins; but there too, save for the seasonal and lunar festivals, neither the annual framework nor any periodic framework is the essential element; the principal concern is with royal rituals, which are distributed throughout a king's career, first on the occasion of his consecration, then at various times when he requires a confirmation or a promotion in power and dignity in his kingdom or in meeting with other kings. Certain seasons are more highly recommended than others for the celebration or at least the commencement of these “sessions,” which sometimes stretch out over weeks, months, or years, but these specifications are secondary. Since they are occasional, the rites are not fixed in time.

As the comparison of several festivals of the Roman ritual with Indian rituals is particularly revealing (the October Horse and *aśva-medha*, *fordicidia* and *aṣṭāpadi*, *suouetaurilia* and *sautrāmaṇi*, etc.),² it is necessary, before undertaking it, to bear in mind these differences: often, something in the Vedic treatises which is only one episode in a vast design will correspond to something in the Roman calendar

2. Below, pp. 224–27, 371–73, 237–40.

which is a ritual unity, an autonomous ceremony; on the other hand, the role of and the profit to the *rex* in the ritual activity of society, at least in the form in which we know that society, are much more modest than those of the *rājan*; for example, a Roman agrarian festival would be comparable to an agrarian fragment of a royal Indian consecration.

This same fixity on special areas characterizes the locations of the cult, and this too, which does not seem worthy of notice to the Hellenist, is quite different from the framework in which the religious activity of the Vedic societies is performed. Before decking itself, in the manner of Etruria, and later of Greece, with permanent temples, each dedicated to a divinity, Rome was already full of *sacraria*, small chapels,³ and sacred thickets or open spaces, in which, however far back one goes, the cults were located. One cannot imagine a god who does not have "his place." Vedic India, on the contrary, as a legacy from the times of migration, does not confine the cult to fixed sanctuaries. For each ceremony a location is chosen and ritually prepared, according to rules which have, as we shall see, remarkable analogues at Rome, but the decor is temporary and undifferentiated.

Finally, the same remarks apply to the personages of the cult. Not only are the *pontifex*, or rather the relatively free *pontifices*, and the various flamens, each attached and restricted to the service for which he has been chosen, irrevocably distinct, but the *Salii*, the *Fratres Arvales*, the *Luperci*, and all the sodalities and colleges are likewise specialized. Rome abounded in priests, and each of the principal groups was capable of transmitting faithfully from generation to generation its techniques and the knowledge which justified it, but there is no trace of the general versatility which formed the unity and strength of the co-optative order of the druids, among the Celts, and of the endogamous brahman class, among the Indians. An educated Vedic priest was competent to play any role in any sacrificial team, the differentiation being in the roles, not in the men.

This tendency, basically the same in the utilization of sacred times, places, and men, will have to be examined more closely. It attests that the Latin society which settled on the banks of the Tiber was

3. In primitive times open to the sky, according to Fest. p. 413 L²; Gell. 7.12.5 gives a more general meaning to *sacellum*: *locus parvus deo sacratus cum ara*.

actually and ideologically further removed from the period of mobility which its ancestors had passed through than the Vedic and Celtic societies. Even before the formation of legends and speculations concerning the eternality of Rome and the guarantees given by the gods as to the permanence of its site; before the stubborn Juventas refused to let herself be exaugurated⁴ to make room for Jupiter on the Capitol, the Romans were more closely attached to their corner of the earth than any people of those other Indo-European regions who share so many conceptions and practices with them. Moreover it is not superfluous, on the threshold of this presentation, to recall some other divergences in the "ideological field" which result from the same early and profound "rooting" and which distinguish Rome from India. We must not lose sight of these differences when we compare homologous but dissimilar facts in these two areas.

The Romans think *historically*, while the Indians think *fabulously*. In each country, every narrative concerns a bit of the past, but to have an audience among the Romans this past must be relatively recent, must be located in time as well as in space, must concern men rather than imaginary creatures, and must generally involve as little as possible forces and motives which are alien to everyday life. By contrast, the Indians have a taste for immense stretches of space and time; they are as fond of the magnifying imprecision as of the grandiose monstrosity; and they are partial to miracles.

The Romans think *nationally* and the Indians *cosmically*. The former are interested in a story only if it has some connection with Rome, if it is presented as "Roman history," justifying some detail in the organization of the city, a positive or negative rule of conduct, a Roman conception or prejudice. By contrast, the Indians, at least those of them who record and develop the myths, are not interested in ephemeral fatherlands; their concern is rather with the origins, the vicissitudes, and the rhythms of the grand Whole, of the Universe itself rather than of humanity.

The Romans think *practically* and the Indians *philosophically*. The Romans do not speculate; if they are in a position to act, if they are clear in their own minds about the object and the means of their action, they are satisfied and do not seek to invent or to gain deeper understanding. The Indians live in the world of ideas, in contemplation, conscious of the inferiority and the dangers of the act, of desire, of existence itself.

The Romans think *relatively*, *empirically*; the Indians think *absolutely*,

4. The word occurs in Liv. 1.55.3; P. Catalano, *DA*, pp. 281-88, thinks that the precise term would be *evocare*.

dogmatically. The former are constantly keeping watch over the evolution of life, doubtless in order to curb it, but also to justify it and give it an acceptable form. The edict of the praetor, the votes of the comitia, the subtle or violent duels of the magistrates assure at all times a just balance between being and becoming, between tradition and the demands of the present. The Indian is concerned only with the immutable; for him change is illusion, imperfection, or sacrilege, depending on the materials involved; therefore the maxims which regulate human relations are unchangeable, as is the social organization itself, and as is all legitimate organization, all *dharma*.

The Romans think *politically*, the Indians think *morally*. Since the most august reality available to the senses is Rome, since the life of Rome is a constantly recurring problem, and since religion itself is only one element in the public administration, all reflections and all efforts of the Romans are directed toward the *res publica*, all duties, all regulations, and consequently all the narratives which form the treasury of Roman wisdom are focused on politics, on political institutions and procedures, on the casuistry of the consul, or of the censor, or of the tribune. For the Indians, from the loftiest to the lowliest, every man is involved with the gods or with the great ideas which the gods represent. Since the social order is not absolute, or rather draws its absolute quality only from its conformity with the general laws of the world, everything which concerns it is only a secondary science, deduced from higher truths, and is not an art based directly on the examination of its materials.

Finally, the Romans think *juridically*, the Indians think *mystically*. The Romans very early isolated the idea of *persona*, and it is on this idea, on the autonomy, the stability, and the dignity of persons, that they constructed their ideal of human relations—*ius*—with the gods intervening only as witnesses and guarantors. India on the other hand persuaded itself more and more that individuals are only deceptive appearances and that only the profound One exists; that as a result the true relations between beings, human or otherwise, are those of participation and interpenetration rather than of opposition and negotiation; that in every matter, even the most worldly, the principal participant is the great invisible, in which, as a matter of fact, the visible participants join together.⁵

These traits of Roman imagination and intelligence had important consequences in religion, several of which we have already encountered, and of which the principal remaining ones will now be presented in very general terms.

5. G. Dumézil, *Servius et la Fortune* (1943), pp. 190-93. Analogous comparisons of ideological fields have been made between the Romans and the Celts (Dumézil, *Horace et les Curiaces* [1943], pp. 65-68), and between the Romans and the Iranians (NA, pp. 181-88); see above, p. 7, n. 3.

13

BALANCES IN ROMAN RELIGION

The sum of the cultic relations between men and gods is composed of two sections: the offerings which men make to the gods, and the information which the gods send to men. The relative importance of these two sections is an important characteristic of any religion. The piety of the Romans, which is meticulous with regard to the *sacra*, nevertheless gives the *signa* an attention which makes them the leading clue to Roman behavior.

An empiricist, the Roman is constantly in search of signs which will reveal to him the wishes or the feelings of the gods. Before and during his actions he records those signs which occur, and, above all, he solicits them. To interpret them correctly is an important concern: hence the enormous part played in public and private life by the *auspicia* and the augural art, as well as by the *omina*, and by the prodigies with their *procuratio*. In this respect the meaning acquired at Rome by the derivatives of the old nominal stem **auges-* is instructive.¹

The Indo-Iranians knew the word, without religious coloration, in the meaning of "physical, material force," but with an interesting nuance: as opposed to other quasi-synonyms, Vedic *ójas* means "fullness of strength," strength built up to the point at which it will be consummated in action. Its etymology is clear: based on the root **aug-* "to increase," it is a derivative in *-s*, expressing, as is frequently the case, the capitalized result of the action—not the increase itself, but the fullness which it produces. Similarly, Latin *genus*, Greek *γένος* is not birth, but race; Greek *κλέος*, Vedic *śrávah* is not hearing,

1. "Remarques sur *augur*, *augustus*," REL 35 (1957): 126–51; reprinted in IR, part I, chap. 4; cf. the fine article by J. Gagé in his first style, "*Romulus augustus*," MEFR, 1930, pp. 138–81.

but glory, etc. In the Roman vocabulary the word was restricted to the religious zone of ideology, but in this zone the derivative *augustus* is very close to the Indian meaning: that person or thing is *augustus* which possesses a fullness, a complete supply of a force, not material but mystical. One should thus expect that the *augur* and his activities would have as their mission and effect the conferral of this fullness upon persons or things. Perhaps indeed certain archaic *auguria* do preserve this active value;² in any case, these are only survivals. Essentially, the activity of the augur turns not on the production or the conferral of the full mystical force necessary to the success of an action but on the ascertainment of its presence or absence, or rather—an intermediate position which several facts seem to suggest—on requesting the gods to supply objects with this force in such a way that its presence in them can be affirmed. Thus his art is a consultative, not an operative one. On this particularly important point the vocabulary reveals a shift away from the field of action to that of reception.

But there are signs everywhere. In historical times, one of the primary duties of the consul taking office is to make a report to the Senate *de religione*, that is, about the prodigies which have occurred and on which it will be necessary to consult the Sibylline Books—another product of this constant need for information. He himself will not leave for his province until he has taken the auspices on the citadel. Afterwards the birds of the sky, the caged chickens, the opened bellies of the victims, will unceasingly reveal to him the disposition of the gods.

This is not the place to describe the formidable apparatus for gathering information which Rome assembled against the invisible. But in this connection it is necessary to indicate without delay another important characteristic of this religion. The Roman is not merely an empiricist, he is also reasonable. Pushed to this point, the concern for discovering the feelings of the gods is very close to an obsession. Not only does public credulity dangerously multiply prodigies, during crises and even in periods of calm, but the anxious waiting for the *auspicia oblatiua*, the disposition to hear *omina* everywhere, reminds us of familiar mental troubles. Does the religious life of individuals and of the state suggest psychiatry? The question is not an

2. This is also Latte's opinion, p. 67, n. 1. See below, p. 596 and n. 6.

idle one. Judging from Irish epic tradition, the religious thought of pre-Christian Ireland was troubled by the encroachment and proliferation of another concept, not that of the sign but that of the interdiction. From birth every individual, every king, every warrior, was burdened with prohibitions, and throughout his life was subject to various spells cast over him by powerful men. The network of his *geasa* paralyzed him. To bring about the downfall of the most valiant hero, it was necessary only to catch him between the pincers of two incompatible interdictions. One of the most famous such heroes, whose name contained the word for dog, was forbidden to eat the flesh of this animal; but also he was not allowed, when on the road, to refuse whatever food was offered to him. Thus, in order to destroy him, the sorcerers merely had to station themselves in his path, put a dog in a cauldron, and invite him to eat. Electing to eat, he was doomed to die in the ensuing combat; had he not eaten, however, the other *geis* would have been violated and would certainly also have destroyed him. Signs did not gain such an absolute dominion over the Romans. Good sense protected them, inspiring a casuistry of loopholes as extensive as the threatened dangers. Is it a question of an *omen*? He who perceives it may give it a favorable interpretation, contrary to the original evidence; it is then conceded that the meaning which he assigns to it will prevail. He may reject it altogether (*omen improbare, refutare*), or set it aside by a sacred formula (*abominari, omen exsecrari*), or transfer it mystically to someone else, like a projectile that one flings back at an enemy. Finally, he may choose among several signs that are revealed the one best suited to his purposes. How many words Lucius Aemilius Paullus had to listen to when he left his home to command the Roman army against Perseus, the king of Macedonia! He kept only one: his little daughter came crying to tell him that her dog, named "Persa," was dead (Cic. *Diu.* 1.103). Against the *auspicia oblativa*, those unsolicited signs which may at any moment thwart an already initiated enterprise, there are just as many defenses. First, one can arrange not to see them: the consul M. Claudius Marcellus went about on a closed litter. Like the *omina*, they may be rejected (*refutare, repudiare*). More subtly, one may say that one did not pay attention to them (*non observare*), which is enough to render them harmless, like a projectile which glances off without penetrating. Many of the *prodigia* which are recorded in the

annual lists of a Julius Obsequens, for example, may seem childish to us; yet we must remind ourselves that after they had been thinned out by the consuls, the latter submitted them to the Senate, which decided which of them was important enough to be kept (*suscipere*). Without this decision, the whole year would not have been time enough for the magistrates and priests to "procure" all the products of delirious minds. Was it a matter of solicited signs, *impetratiua*, and of licensed consultants? They did not lack for resources, which J. Bayet sums up in excellent terms:

These technicians themselves, faithful to the inclination of the Latin spirit, gradually mastered the signs which they were reputed to submit to passively. The taker of auspices further widens the traditional liberties: with his curved staff (*lituus*) he delimits the *templum* in which the presages will be valid, and actually orients it by means of his words. He chooses the birds which he intends to observe, two on the left and two on the right; at any time he may disregard a sign simply by saying *non consulto*; he may even name something not seen, and thus bring it into existence. The choice of time (*tempestas*), the dissociation of the observation and the *renuntiatio* (formulation), the declaration of "errors" (*uitia*), and the retaking on new foundations of faulty auspices increase the range of arbitrary action. The possibilities left to chance will finally be reduced to almost nothing in the *pullaria auguria*. Confined in a cage, the sacred chickens will hardly fail to give the augur the indication he desires, by following the direction of their appetites.³

These limitations and fakings raise a problem, and a number of other facts on the same order raise it as well: how sincere was the Roman, whether layman or priest, who acted in this way? To deny what one has seen, to declare something that one has not seen, seriously to record as a divine sign something that one has actually made inevitable beforehand—is not all this a kind of gymnastics ruinous to the sense of the sacred, to *timor* and *reuerentia*? Can man compartmentalize himself to such a point that, believing in the gods, he substitutes himself for them in the role which he assigns to them? During the last centuries of the Republic we know well enough the abuses to which these facilities were subjected in order to advance political intrigues; however, we are not concerned with abuses, but rather with ordinary practice, with the very principle of these

3. *Histoire politique* . . . , p. 55; cf. Plin. *N.H.* 28.17: in *augurum certe disciplina constat neque ulla auspicia pertinere ad eos qui quamque rem ingredientibus observare se ea negauerint*.

displays. To be sure, it is impossible to reply with assurance, but it does not seem that they impaired the *grauitas* with which the Roman regarded religion.

In matters of law, where he is a past master, does he not preserve a clear and profound idea of what is just, at the same time that he turns the doubtful case to his advantage by using every trick of legal procedure? In him sincerity and artfulness get along well together. On the other hand, the practice of the tribunal, coinciding with and reinforcing a very ancient and doubtless universal belief, proved to him the power of the word, a power not merely of definition or affirmation but of creation. The three famous words which the judge pronounces, *do, dico, addico*, truly create a situation, end a debate, or legitimate a claim—and he may refuse to pronounce them. I have recalled above the role of caution and prudence in juridical practice, and the extensions which it has in Roman approaches to the divine. Its opposite, this feeling of sovereignty, often without appeal, which the enunciation of the decisive words gives to the testator, to the seller, to him who sets free or him who marries, did not remain unechoed in the other law, where the opponent was invisible. In this field as well, why would not an affirmation by the person concerned create a legitimate situation? The lie itself is permitted, or even required in certain cases of human law. The device commonly used in one of the oldest methods of property transfer, the *in iure cessio*, is the feigned indifference and silence of the alienator when, in the presence of the magistrate, the buyer falsely claims that the property belongs to him. When the youthful Clodius, in love with Caesar's wife Pompeia, was surprised in women's clothes in Caesar's house during the rites of Bona Dea, which were restricted to women, he was haled into the tribunal for sacrilege by one of the tribunes. Caesar divorced Pompeia, but when called to witness against Clodius, he declared himself ignorant of all the facts with which the accused was charged. The accuser then asked him why he had divorced his wife. He replied, "It is because my wife must not even be suspected." On this unbelievable but incontestable testimony Clodius was declared innocent (Plut. *Caes.* 10.4). To say that one has not noticed an oblativie auspice is not a greater lie and has the same juridical power of annulling the fact. We must admit that this mixture of faith and deception was sincere, that it did not cause a conflict in the

conscience of the persons involved, and in spite of the many centuries of criticism and skepticism which have intervened between Marcellus and us, we must try to understand the balance in which he kept his belief in the authenticity of signs and his stratagems not to see them.

This remark will be extended well beyond the theory of signs to the whole of Roman religion. A flattering story, probably fictitious, illustrates this state of mind in another matter, the *ius fetiale*. After the shameful capitulation at the Caudine Forks, one of the defeated consuls, Sp. Postumius, having returned to Rome, advised the Senate to send him back to the Samnites, along with the other authors of the capitulation, as guilty of having pledged the word of the Roman people without having the right to do so. Accordingly the fetials conducted them to the Samnite camp. Then, while a fetial, one of the inviolable priests, was delivering them to the enemy, "Postumius thrust his knee into the other's thigh, with all the force he could summon up, and proclaimed in a loud voice that he was a Samnite citizen, who had maltreated the envoy in violation of the law of nations [*ius gentium*], whereby the Romans would make war with the better right [*iustius bellum*]" (Liv. 9.10.10). The Samnite leader protested and invoked the gods, but the gods had doubtless judged the blow to be correct, since soon afterward it was the turn of the Samnites to pass beneath the yoke. We moderns are tempted to ask here: who is being fooled; whom did they hope to deceive? The word is improper. The Roman does not deceive the gods. He treats them as lawyers who are just as convinced as he of the value of forms; he ascribes to them the connoisseur's taste for the adroit use of a technicality. Think of the patent of lawful cunning which Jupiter bestows on Numa: *o uir colloquio non abigende meo*.⁴ This kind of familiarity and complicity with superior colleagues does not exclude faith; it implies it. Even concerning the Hellenizing centuries, when the Romans were put on their guard by the philosophers and critics of religion, one must avoid speaking of free thought or atheism. To be sure, traditional religion, like everything else in these centuries, is debased and corrupted, but there survives in the most emancipated spirits the very conscious feeling that the prodigious good fortune of the city at least justifies its rites, its practices, and consequently its gods, to the

4. Above, pp. 40-41.

very large degree that its rites require gods. Even today, more than one middle position between blind faith and calculated adherence, logically uncomfortable but sentimentally satisfying, is open to the members of the great religions whom one can see flitting from one roost to the other according to the events of their lives, with longer or shorter periods of flight in indifference or negation. Things must have been equally simple in Rome. Just because he translated Euhemerus, Ennius was probably not an atheist, and the sacrifices offered to the immortal gods by Julius Caesar were not all political comedy.

In matters other than signs, Roman religion offers the same equilibrium, the same happy balancing of one tendency by its opposite. First, in the principles of the cult. It has been too often repeated that Roman cult is a trade. It is true, but, except for the mystical forms, is not this usually the case in all religions? *Do ut des* may be read, word for word, in the liturgical books of the Indians and shows through the greater number of the Vedic hymns, where, if we forget the rhetorical artifices and the poetic beauties, there remains only the elementary proposition "I praise you, help me," or "I offer to you, give to me." It must be admitted that this is the same form of reckoning which justifies the regular course of the *sacra* and likewise supports the *vota*, with the additional nuance of a condition and a date of maturity: "If you give to me, I will offer," the things to be offered being carefully specified. On the other hand, the *procuratio prodigiorum* assumes the aspect of a kind of divine blackmail. The gods threaten, but nobody really knows why; the Books are consulted to find out what they want, and payment is made. But religion is more than this; it is not restricted to what happens at the altar. There is a general and constant attitude of respect, a serious way of speaking the divine names; in the earliest times there is the qualification of *pater* and *mater*, given to the principal gods; as a happy by-product of the demythologizing process, until it is complicated and spoiled by Greece, there is the purity and dignity of the almost abstract conception of the gods; and finally there is the feeling of their *maiestas*, which causes the safest transaction with them to be that of the good *cliens*, acting faithfully and devotedly, without reservation or selfish motive, toward his powerful *patronus*:

*Dis te minorem quod geris, imperas,
hinc omne principium, huc refer exitum . . .*

In the cult itself, the contractual *fides* is not the only one to operate. An excellent recent study has opportunely recalled the connection between Venus and *uenerari*;⁵ when we meet this goddess, the connection will be fully clear; meanwhile we are able to feel that he who *ueneratur* a god brings to him something else than a proposition or a settling of accounts. In terms of reciprocity, the *uenia* of the gods which he solicits, together with their *pax*, is a benefit surpassing anything that might be specified in a contract. It would be anachronistic to bring the heart and its reasons into this discussion, but not everything can be reduced to bartering.

The most important of these balancings of two opposites dominates the very evolution of religion. The Roman, as we have mentioned on several occasions, is scrupulously conservative. During the decay of the sacred science, he will obstinately maintain the traditional acts of the cult, even when he no longer understands them; moreover, with the calm conviction of the *maiestas* which attaches to the name, the usages, and the ideas of Rome, he observes a rigorous and absolute distinction between that which is *patrium* and that which is *peregrinum* or, to use the older term, *hostile*. On the other hand, he is, as we have also mentioned, an empiricist, ready to recognize and evaluate unfamiliar things which may prove to be powerful or useful. The result is that from the earliest times this most traditional of religions does not rule out innovations but rather tolerates, indeed welcomes them; in this respect it seems to contrast with Vedic religion, where the gods and cults of the barbarians are regarded as demoniacal, like the barbarians themselves. According to modalities which we shall consider later, varying considerably according to the partners and the circumstances, Roman religion is almost always ready to acquire recipes for the exploration of the invisible, whether in war or peace, from friend or enemy, in nearby regions or in the far corners of the world. At a rather early date, it seems to have provided itself with a suitable instrument for what was to become a regular function: the great agents of religious growth and innovation, almost balancing the pontiffs, were the *decemviri sacris faciundis*, a team of

5. Below, pp. 421-22.

special priests said to have developed out of *duumviri*.⁶ The debates of the plebs and the patriciate also helped these developments, although one must not regard them as an exclusive contribution of the plebs.⁷

However—another balancing, another equilibrium—until the end of the republican era, even in the midst of the troubles of the last centuries, innovations which were tolerated in the private domain, accepted and even desired in the public domain, remained subject to strict control. In order to be admitted, a god or a cult had to be not only popular or merely compatible with the body of national practices but useful in the judgment of those responsible for religious and political life. A mere craze, as we see in the affair of the Bacchanalia, was an adverse note, and a reason for violent rejection.⁸ Hercules and Apollo, Diana of Aricia and Juno of Veii, Venus of Eryx and the Lady of Pessinus, all brought positive strength to Rome—so opportune, even, as far as the last-named are concerned, that the question of sincerity on the part of the decemvirs who had read the order of acquiring them in the Sibylline Books is forcibly raised. But this question too is probably out of place. The Books were grab-bags in which a great many things could be read, like the prophecies of Nostradamus, and the important thing was to know what to read there, in connection with the circumstance which caused them to be consulted and with the whole state of things in the world as well as in the Republic itself. This was not deceit: since obscurity could only be overcome by clarity, it was necessary for the decemvirs, in order to understand the oracles, to keep themselves informed of many things. The reason for their usefulness is that they actually knew better than others what was going on in the world of religion, what values were rising, and that their close connections with the Senate and the high magistrates gave them a good acquaintance with the reasoned demands of Roman political life. This enabled them to understand, with a kind of lofty wisdom, what the supreme wisdom of the gods could not fail to recommend, what in fact it did recommend in the arcane writings. Such, I feel, was the honorable basis of many judicious counsels. There is not a trace of rivalry between the

6. Below, pp. 604-5.

7. D. Sabbatucci, "Patrizi e plebei nello sviluppo della religione Romana," *SMSR* 24-25 (1952-54): 5-21.

8. Below, pp. 515-20.

pontiffs and the decemvirs, between the preservers of tested customs and the men charged with investigating innovations, even though some have claimed to see such a rivalry in the events of 207.⁹ As the augurs themselves limited the risks of their art, the decemvirs made themselves the police of their inspirations.

There is hardly one point of view which does not allow an equally harmonious balance to be observed—and doubtless this is one of the reasons for the easy victory of the Greek and Oriental cults in the last centuries of the Republic. The proportion of collectivity and individual acts in the development and even in the administration of religion is largely in favor of collectivity. Even if we think that the good idea of calling the Lady of Pessinus to Rome was an inspiration of one of the decemvirs, it was so completely adopted by the others and by the aristocracy that it was, from the beginning, the property of everybody. The *uota* of generals on fields of battle created cults of already existing gods, under different names, as well as cults of personified abstractions based on familiar models, and it also appears, in the earliest times, that the state was bound by the *euocatio* of certain enemy gods, but this tendency does not go very far. We must wait for Sulla and the great individuals who followed him to see the imposition of truly personal cults on collective Roman religion. In any case, there is one type of personality who was not known at Rome or who was eliminated very early: this is the Inspired One, the man whose mouth, without the filter of a ritual technique or the control of colleagues, transmits extemporaneously the thought of a god. The Latin substantive *uates*¹⁰ corresponds closely to the *uati*- of the Gauls and the *faith* of the Irish, but it is only a verbal correspondence. *Vates* is not a title of a recognized function, does not locate a man in a public office, like *augur* or *haruspex*. While contact with Greek thought will later restore some of its early strength, especially as it is applied to inspired poets, it is meanwhile a vague term for anybody who "divines." Still, this last word is deceptive: *diuinitio* is not practiced by enthusiasts; it is the act of cold interpreters of signs. The man most fully involved in sacred matters is undoubtedly the *flamen Dialis*, who is daily

9. Below, pp. 481-83.

10. M. Runes, "Geschichte des Wortes *uates*," *Festschrift P. Kretschmer* (1926), pp. 202-16; H. Dahlmann, "Vates," *Philol.* 97 (1948): 337-53.

feriatus in the service of his god; at the same time no man is less free in his relations with sacred matters, or with this god, and his entire behavior is determined by immutable rules. Under the Republic, nobody is predestined to a religious office. The co-optation, or even the choice of the great pontiff, which cannot be appealed, and later the vote of one part of the people, create the principal priests. One is not born an augur or a Vestal; one is not the object of a divine election; no supernatural sign indicates a vocation.¹¹ Was it always thus? No, probably not. The college of augurs boasted a great ancestor of royal times, Attus Navius, and one glimpses in his type, somewhat disciplined by tradition, a little of what his successors lack (Cic. *Diu.* 1.17). When he was a small boy, and very poor, he was watching over his father's pigs when one of the animals disappeared. He promised the gods, if he should recover it, that he would offer them the largest bunch of grapes in the family vineyard. After recovering the pig, he went to the center of the vineyard where, facing south, he divided the vineyard into four sections and then watched the birds. Going to the part which they indicated, he found a bunch of extraordinary size. Thus marked out by heaven itself as "gifted," he acquired great glory and many customers, and became the king's augur.

11. The *inauguratio* of some priests signifies something else: the consent of the gods after the free choice by men (see above, p. 107 and n. 3).

14

THE VOCABULARY OF THE SACRED

A quarter of a century ago, in his famous book *Das Heilige im Germanischen*, W. Baetke traced through the development of the Germanic languages the words arising from two roots designating two orientations of the idea of the sacred, which do not oppose but complement each other. These orientations are represented, in German, by the words *weihen* and *heilig*. On the one hand is the sacredness of separation; in Old Norse, *vé* is that which has been cut off from ordinary usage and belongs to a god. On the other hand there is positive sacredness, the quality, indefinable but evident from its effects, which distinguishes certain beings and things from the ordinary. Toward the former, man's attitude is one of reserve, of awe, and this is certainly the attitude which the gods require under this aspect; piety is expressed here chiefly in terms of prohibitions: do not touch, do not enter, or do so only under specially determined conditions and with proper precautions. Toward the latter, man's attitude has greater shading; his respect is tinged with admiration, and does not exclude trust and a certain familiarity; under this aspect, the gods themselves are active and accessible; they expand and communicate their power; piety here is expressed by prayer and offerings, practically by the entire cult. This analysis, roughly summed up here,¹ goes far beyond the Germanic dossier which established it.

At Rome, the expressions of these two aspects are *sacer* and *augustus*. However, in the state of the religion which we are able to observe, the

1. These pages were written before the publication of Mlle Huguette Fugier's excellent book, *Recherches sur l'expression du sacré dans la langue latine* (1963), to which the reader should refer. Except on some secondary points (the primitive meaning of the root of *sacer*; the positive initial value of *religio* . . .), I find myself in agreement with these lucid analyses.

two terms no longer balance each other. *Augustus*, as I have remarked,² describes the person or thing endowed with the "fullness of mystical power," which was originally designated by **auges-*; but as the augurs and their art developed into a kind of consultative function, the word *augustus* was cut off at an early stage from the words *augur* and *auguria*, and does not properly belong to the language of religion. It scarcely plays any role elsewhere, as if the gods had kept it in reserve during the course of the history and literature of the Republic, and had saved it for the striking use which Octavius would make of it. On the other hand, *sacer* is a religious concept and a living concept; by chance it occurs, in the form *sakros*, on the oldest preserved inscription,³ with a formulary force which it later retains. *Sacer* describes that which is reserved and kept apart for the gods, whether by nature or by human agency.⁴ In the *sacri-ficium*, the animal, the *uictima* (a word derived from the root of *weißen*), is removed from its normal use and delivered to the invisible recipient, even though a part of its body is given back to the *profanum* (*profanare*)⁵ and must finally be consumed by men. The violator of certain rules or of certain places and the unchaste Vestal are, by their very fault, *consecrati*; the phrase *sakros esed*, *sacer esto*, in primitive times apparently without specification of a particular god, refers to the world of the gods as a whole in its dealings with mankind.

Priestly reflections have colored the idea of *sacer* and provided it with quasi-synonyms. One of these distinctions is remarkable, because it is based on the juxtaposition of three notions, three domains—the purely divine, the military, and the subterranean—which is undoubtedly very ancient.⁶ It is the division of the materials of the *ius diuinum* into *res sacrae*, *res sanctae*, and *res religiosae*, a division to

2. Above, pp. 118–19.

3. Above, p. 94.

4. Fest. p. 414 L²: *Gallus Aelius ait sacrum esse quo[d]cumque modo atque instituto ciuitatis consecratum est, siue aedis siue ara siue signum locus siue pecunia, siue aliud quod dis dedicatum atque consecratum sit; quod autem priuati suae religionis causa aliquid earum rerum deo dicent, id pontifices Romanos non existimare sacrum*. See D. Sabbatucci, "Sacer," *SMSR* 23 (1952): 91–101; Fugier, pp. 57–127, 199–247.

5. H. Wagenvoort, "Profānus, profānāre," *Mnem.*, 4th ser., 2 (1949): 319–22; E. Benveniste, "Profanus et profanare," *Coll. Lat.* 45 (*Hommages à G. Dumézil*) (1960): 46–53.

6. L. Gerschel, in my *JMQ* 4: 175–76. On *sanctus*, M. Link, *De uocis sanctus usu pagano* (1912), and especially Fugier, pp. 179–97, 249–90. For the etymology of the words cited here, the data, if not always the probable options, will be found in Walde-Hofmann, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch*.

which no age can be assigned. It definitely antedates the juriconsult C. Aelius Gallus (who says that it *satis constare*), that is to say, Verrius Flaccus, whose abridger writes: . . . *inter sacrum autem et sanctum et religiosum differentias bellissime refert* [Gallus]: *sacrum aedificium, consecratum deo; sanctum murum, qui sit circa oppidum; religiosum sepulcrum, ubi mortuus sepultus aut humatus sit.*⁷ This doctrine appears at the beginning of the second of the *Institutionum commentarii* of Gaius (3-8), but the author seems to be annoyed by the military connotation ascribed to *sanctus*. He first distinguishes the two other epithets in terms of two divine species, the *res sacrae* being those *quae diis superis consecratae sunt* and the *res religiosae* those *quae diis manibus relictæ sunt*. He adds, in a kind of postscript, *sanctæ quoque res, velut muri et portæ, quodammodo diuini iuris sunt*. But the doctrine is firmly established: in the *Digest* 1.8.8, Marcianus defines *sanctus* by two military terms: *sanctum est quod ab iniuria hominum defensum atque munitum est*. Outside of this technical usage the nuance does not appear. Before Augustus, *sanctus* does not describe many gods (Naevius refers to *sanctus Pithius Apollo* and Ennius to *sancta Venus, et pater Tiberine tuo cum flumine sancto*); but *sancti uiri, sanctissimi uiri*, which belong to the best language, bring the word close to the area of *augustus*.

Another fundamental religious term is *fas*, which is still the subject of discussion by jurists, religious historians, and linguists, and which has a weighty bibliography.⁸ The articulation of *fas* with *ius* is an ancient one, even though *ius* was secularized in Latin; it is not to be understood, as some of the ancients were already doing, as the superimposing of some "divine law" onto "human law." It is my feeling that *fās* does not belong to the root of *fari* (**bhā-*), with which the

7. The discussion by Mlle Fugier (pp. 290-92) against L. Gerschel rests on a mistake: Gerschel did not contend that those were the ancient, primary values of the three adjectives; he only noted that they were arranged by the Roman scholars, whether rightly or wrongly, according to the scheme of the "three functions." On the third term, see F. de Visscher, "Locus religiosus," *Atti del Congresso internazionale di diritto romano* (1948), 3 (1951): 181-88.

8. I can do no more than express my feelings here, without entering into this immense discussion. I have seen with pleasure that they are shared by Mlle Fugier (pp. 127-51). The data are collected with diverse interpretations, especially in C. A. Peeters, *Fas en Nefas*, *Diss. Utrecht* (1945), and in J. Paoli, "Les définitions varroniennes des jours fastes et néfastes," *Revue historique de droit français et étranger*, 4th ser., 29 (1952): 293-327. Linguistically, see *fas* in the etymological dictionaries, whose preference for a *fas-fari* relationship (on which is based the famous Varronian definition of the *nefasti dies* as those on which it is *nefas fari praetorem "do, dico, addico,"* L.L. 6.29) is not compelling.

ancients connected it, but to that of *facio* (**dhē-*) in its primary meaning, "to place," and I am inclined to see a connection between *fas* (**dhās-*) and *ius* comparable to that which one glimpses in Vedic between the two concepts of the world order, *dhāman* and *ṛtā*: *fas* would be the mystical, invisible basis without which *ius* is not possible, and which sustains all the visible arrangements and relations defined by *ius*.⁹ *Fas* is not subject to analysis and casuistry as is *ius*, and it is not divisible like *ius*. It is or it is not, *fas est*, *fas non est*. A time or a place are *fasti* or *nefasti* according as they provide or do not provide human activity with this mystical basis which is its principal security. By what criteria did the earliest Romans distinguish these qualities and decide the presence or the absence of the "foundation"? We have no way of knowing. But the notion was certainly important. We have seen above its probable connection with the mission of the *fetiales*.

Latin does not have a word to designate religion. *Religio*,¹⁰ *caerimonia*,¹¹ the latter of obscure origin, do not cover the whole field; both are frequently used in the plural. The most general term is *colere deos* (the substantive *cultus deorum* occurs several times in Cicero), with a commonplace use of a verb which has no technical applications.

Pius (*pīus*), *pietas*, were summoned to a splendid future from humble beginnings. The word is known in other Italic languages, but it would be rash to say that the Volscian *pihom estu* is equivalent to the Latin formula *fas est*,¹² or that in Latin itself *piare*, *piaculum*, and *expiare* show a trace of this ancient meaning. *Piare* is not "ein nefastum beseitigen," but "to atone for the violation of a natural duty," and *pihom estu* must have had the same overtones—not simply "One may act without the risk of a mystical accident," but "One may act

9. A. Bergaigne, *La Religion védique* 3 (1883): 220 (cf. pp. 218-19, 239), remarks that the *RgVeda* several times uses the expressions "*dhāman* (or *dhārman*, or *vratā*) of the *ṛtā*," but never the expressions "*ṛtā* of the *dhāman* (etc.)"; "*ṛtā*" he says, "may be governed in the genitive by any one of the three other [words of the group]; . . . there always remains [despite the attenuations of the etymological meanings] this difference between the word *ṛtā* and the other three, that it never governs any of them in the genitive."

10. C. Koch, *Religio* (1960), p. 100, n. 11, remarks that the concept opposed to *religio* seems to occur in the verb *negligere*.

11. In last place, K. H. Roloff, "Caerimonia," *Glotta* 32 (1953): 101-38, and H. Wagenvoort, "Caerimonia," *Studies in Roman Literature, Culture and Religion* (1956), pp. 84-101.

12. Latte, pp. 39-40; on the secularization of the word, *ibid.*, p. 40, n. 4; H. Wagenvoort, "Pietas," *Inaugural Lecture, Groningen* (1924). The idea of *pietas*, which dominates the *Aeneid*, has inspired P. Boyancé to a fine chapter of his *Religion de Virgile* (1963), pp. 58-82, and one will naturally refer to Fugier, pp. 331-415. See below, p. 398 and n. 2.

without violating any duty." The two permissions converge, but their origins are different. In short, the connotation of *pius* is allied to *ius* rather than to *fas*, but with a moral rather than a juridical coloration. *Pietas* consists in conformity with normal, traditional, indisputable relationships, resulting from the definition and placement of the terms, which exist reciprocally between people of the same blood and the same *ciuitas*, between neighbors, between allies, and between contracting parties; or, without reciprocity, between the individual and that which is superior to him—his country, the gods, and finally humanity. Rome wages a *bellum pium et iustum*,¹³ when it has been duly established that the enemy has violated and that Rome itself has respected the spirit as well as the letter of former agreements. *Iustus* may conceal tricks or snares of duplicity; *pius* is straightforward. This term, which is only partly religious, reveals one of the definite though hardly stressed connections between Roman religion and natural morals.

What is expected of the gods is primarily their *pax*, in the ordinary meaning of the word: normal and benevolent relations. The word is ancient. The Umbrian ritual of Iguvium asks the divinities to be simultaneously *foner pacrer* (VI b, 61; in the singular *fos pacer*, VI a, 23 etc.), that is, *fauentes* and **pacri-*, two quasi-synonyms of which the first is probably more active than the second. In Latin, the root of *paciscor* has not produced an adjective; and the desire for an inclination of the god toward man is indicated by imagery: *propitius*, which is ancient and of undeterminable date, but Ciceronian, and *praesens*, which serves as the participle of *adesse*.¹⁴

13. *piho-* and the correlative of *iusto-* (*med(es)to-*) are likewise associated in Oscan formulae: Vetter, no. 183, *μεροεδ πηεδ* (from **peied*?). An entirely satisfactory etymology of *pi(h)o-* has not yet been proposed.

14. Other important words: *ritus*, *rīte*, discussed by K. H. Roloff, "Ritus," *Glotta* 33 (1954): 36-65.

15

THE PURPOSE OF THIS BOOK

Archaic Roman Religion is not a handbook or a reference work. An effort has been made not to neglect any important question, but a number of minor debates have been omitted. Nor is it a catalog of the Roman cults: for example, with regard to the personified abstractions which multiplied so greatly from the third century on, I have limited myself to commenting on the principal ones, those in which the creative process is most apparent. The service which this book hopes to render is merely to point out the guiding characteristics of Roman religious thought, the great articulations of the religious structure which dominated the growth of Rome, the mechanisms by which this structure was first enriched, then burdened, and finally weakened until it disintegrated, while the elements of a new equilibrium were being assembled.

Contrary to the fashion of today, theology has been retained in the place of honor. The preceding chapters of my "Preliminary Remarks" justify this option. From the beginning, Roman religion summed up and personalized its constituent ideas in the figures of the gods and in the relations between these figures, and essentially the cult was the service of the gods, not an incoherent collection of magical recipes.

I have refused to choose between the "systematic approach" and the "historical approach." This classic dilemma is illusory. I undertake to show that the men who created Rome arrived at their site already in possession of a considerable religious heritage, which it would be wrong to try to explain by means of their further experience. This ancient, already well-structured body of theological material must first be isolated, without pretending to account for it with the help of ad hoc pseudo-history. But, except for this material, every-

thing is history, obscure and uncertain for long stretches of time and to be accepted as such, more definite and precise as one approaches the third century B.C. Consequently the "systematic" framework is necessary for the beginnings, the "historical" for the last centuries. Within each one, however, the other point of view must remain open. For example, in a "systematic" treatment of the pre-Capitoline triad, the most ancient structure that we touch on, it would be artificial and dangerous, under the pretext of observing a chronological division, to analyze only the earliest forms of Jupiter, Mars, and Quirinus, as they are outlined by some definitely archaic data, and to reserve the later Jupiter, Mars, and Quirinus for other chapters. In the very first part of the book, where we take under observation these three gods who remain continuously important, we shall follow them through their evolution, thus clarifying in advance the more "historical" chapters which will come later. This flexibility is not the result of incoherence but of adapting to the materials. It avoids difficulties of exposition which would soon become insurmountable; at the same time it lessens the dangers of error and arbitrary judgment by considering in one place the various elements of a long career which was, despite everything, unitary.

On the other hand, for the reasons listed above, we cannot consider the "Staatsreligion" as a secondary product superimposed on the "religion of the peasants" or emerging from it. From the beginning, society and the *regnum* had their cults and their gods; occasionally private individuals borrowed these cults and gods, but they did not belong to them. Thus it is essentially the public religion which we shall consider, saving for the end the data, which are scanty enough, relating to the private cults.

We shall pursue the following plan.

The study of the three gods composing the pre-Capitoline triad and of their associates will naturally be completed by the study of the Capitoline triad, since Jupiter there takes on a new dimension, although one of the two divine figures with whom he is associated does not have an extensive range and is even suspected to be of foreign origin. The other theological representations and figures from the ancient theological material will then be reviewed in a simple order: those which give religious thought and activity their cultic, temporal, and local outlines; those which directly concern

man in this world and the next; and those which govern the great processes, economic or otherwise, by which society exists.

We shall then consider the first extensions of the divine beings, applying ourselves especially to the analysis and illustration of the extremely varied means of this enrichment: personified abstractions; borrowings from the nearest neighbors; "evoked" gods and conquered gods; the first naturalization, on the spot, of gods imported by the Greeks; Greek gods acquired from more distant places, and finally from Greece itself. We shall then attempt to survey rapidly, in its major outlines, the chronology of these movements, of which only the final ones occurred in the full light of history.

Having thus prepared the religious groundwork, we shall watch it functioning, for the best interests and immediate needs of Rome, during the terrible crisis of the war with Hannibal, but at the same time being transformed and pervaded by a Hellenism at once fecundating and destructive, against which the conservative forces will raise awkward and futile defenses. The period of the civil wars will hasten this development. We shall observe it through the men who successively became the masters of Rome, up to the point at which there remained nothing but great confusion, ready for the work of the new Romulus.

Turning back, in a kind of appendix, we shall study for their own sakes the methods, operative and receptive, by which Roman society kept in constant touch with the divine powers: sacrifices and ceremonies, sacerdotal organization, and the interpretation of signs. Finally, leaving the public worship, we shall describe some well-known and characteristic elements of private worship.

This inquiry does not confine itself to any one school or any pre-fabricated doctrine. If we encounter "the primitive," "the agrarian," or "the solar," we shall explore it. Contrary to an accusation constantly made by hasty critics, it will be firmly established that there is here no "Indo-European imperialism," that the "Indo-European tripartition" does not crop up at every turn, with or without reason. When Indo-European analogies do occur, however, we shall welcome them. It is not our fault that comparison with Vedic facts is often possible and more useful than parallels with only the Greek religion.¹

1. For the historical account of my Indo-European research, for my early gropings, and for what I regard as out of date, see *Idéol.*, pp. 90-92, and the Introduction of *ME*, 1; the

Notes have been reduced to a minimum. The reader will at all times easily find the documentary complements on any particular point by referring to the corresponding rubrics in the great standard reference works, each with its own style and its own merits: *Dictionnaire des antiquités* of Daremberg, Saglio, Pottier, and others; *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* of Roscher; *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* of Pauly, Wissowa, Kroll, and others. He will also make use of the existing handbooks, primarily that of Wissowa, which has a clear plan and a well-made index, and also, with less ease, that of Latte, where he will above all find some complements of epigraphic documentation, often important. Finally, for the doctrine, he will compare what these books say with what is proposed here. Consequently, I have taken two decisions.²

The notes refer the reader to these five handbooks or reference works only when there is a reason for drawing particular attention to them. In all other cases, the reader should consider himself as permanently directed to their riches. Moreover, he will find in the notes enough references to form a primary bibliography on the majority of subjects.

The discussions of others have likewise been generally avoided, except on the essential points, such as the theory of Mars or of Quirinus.³ This reserve, which is not always due to ignorance, never implies scorn for other opinions. But in a domain as heavily frequented as the religion of the ancient Romans, the slightest controversy, to be properly conducted, requires a considerable number of pages. Moreover, I intend to examine in a subsequent book the history of

labor of self-criticism is not complete: in the present volume many points have been improved (for example, the appreciation of the evidences of the Jupiter-Mars-Quirinus triad; the discussion of the arguments brought in support of the "agrarian Mars"; and the *flamen-brahmān* problem).

2. The reader is likewise permanently referred to the two great Latin etymological dictionaries: that of A. Meillet and A. Ernout, 4th ed. (1959-60); and that of J.-B. Hofmann 3d ed. of A. Walde's dictionary (1938-55).

3. In consequence, the bibliographical notes will often indicate, without criticism, books or articles supporting opinions which differ from mine. It has also been necessary to impose limitations on references to ancient sources: first, on principle, the justifications for the facts of religious history have been cited, but not for those of political and literary history; second, for religious facts, the sources have been directly cited, or at least the principal source (which the *RE*, *Wiss.*, etc., will fill out without difficulty; the indication "etc." noting that there is abundant attestation); or else I have referred to an earlier study or to a monograph in which the references to the sources are grouped.

Roman religious studies from the beginning of the century, since many scholars have set forth personal views on this controversial field. For authors like J. Bayet, P. Boyancé, J. Carcopino, J. Gagé, A. Grenier, J. Heurgon, and A. Piganiol in France, A. Alföldi, F. Altheim, F. Bömer, A. Brelich, K. Kerényi, A. Momigliano, H. J. Rose, and H. Wagenvoort outside of France, it will be interesting to make analyses of their method and descriptions of their work, conducting both with freedom and sympathy. In the same book I shall also examine the criticisms of the present *Archaic Roman Religion* which those scholars whose theses it contradicts will write or cause to be written. To this set purpose of conciliation I have allowed myself only one exception, on behalf of Kurt Latte;⁴ first, because his handbook is going to dominate Latin studies for one or two generations, as Wissowa's, which it is bound to replace, has done; and also because this scholar has raised against the whole of my work a prejudicial objection (p. 9 and n. 3) which must be put to the proof in specific instances.⁵ The reader will thus have many occasions to compare two conceptions of the rights and obligations of philological criticism.

4. The manuscript of the French edition of this book was sent to the printer before the death of Kurt Latte in 1964. I have not had to change anything in my criticism, to which I had given a temperate expression.

5. The writer supports his judgment by referring to an article by H. J. Rose, on which see *RHR* 133 (1947-48): 241-43 (cf. *DL*, p. 41, n. 2, and pp. 118-23), and to some lines by C. Koch, on which see below, p. 266 and n. 28. One may read with profit the brief and pertinent reflections of S. Wikander, "Indoeuropeisk religion," *Religion och Bibel* 20 (1961): 3-13 (on Latte's position, pp. 11-12). I myself began to weigh several of Latte's theses in "Religion romaine et critique philologique, 1 and 2," *REL* 39 (1961): 87-93; I intended to continue this examination in the *RHR*. But is it really worthwhile?

FIRST PART

THE GREAT GODS
OF THE
ARCHAIC TRIAD

II

THE ARCHAIC TRIAD: THE DOCUMENTS

In the preceding pages several references have been made to one of the oldest structures to be found in Roman religion: the association, in certain circumstances, of Jupiter, Mars, and Quirinus. In historical times this triad no longer has much vitality, and evidences of it are found only in a few obviously archaic ceremonies, rituals, and priest-hoods. It is nevertheless the oldest vestige of the first stage of theology available to us, and as such it requires that we investigate it first. Moreover, as individuals Mars and Jupiter have always been the most important figures of the pantheon; as for Quirinus, he poses a complex problem, the solution of which involves many others; according to the side one chooses, the interpretation not merely of the triad but of numerous other divinities is differently oriented.

It is to G. Wissowa's credit that he drew attention, in the very beginning of his book, to the existence of the pre-Capitoline triad, even though he did not make use of it as fully as he might have. Here is his presentation, from the second edition (p. 23):

The three *flamines maiores* assure the service of Jupiter, Mars, and Quirinus, and this triad [*dieser Dreiverein*] of gods is also the one which appears as dominant in the most diverse sacred formulas dating from the earliest times. The order of precedence of the highest priests is based on the same conception, which was still flourishing at the end of the Republic, and which placed the *Rex sacrorum* above all the others, followed successively by the *flamines* *Dialis*, *Martialis*, and *Quirinalis*, with the *Pontifex Maximus* forming the last term (Fest. p. 185).¹ The less this corresponds to the real proportions of power and importance of these various priests in later periods, the greater is

1. = pp. 299-300 L².

the probability that this listing reflects a hierarchy, in force in the earliest times, of the divinities represented by these various priests.

And a note enumerates as follows the formulary uses mentioned at the end of the first sentence:

In the ritual of the *Salii*, *Serv. Aen.* 8.663; after the conclusion of a treaty by the *fetials*, *Pol.* 3.25.6; in the formula of *devotio*, *Liv.* 8.9.6; after the consecration of the *spolia opima*, *Fest.* p. 189,² *Plut. Marc.* 8; *Serv. Aen.* 6.860 (when, in the last formula, *Festus* says "Janus Quirinus" instead of "Quirinus," the other evidences prove that this is an inadvertence). An analogous triad seems to have been placed at the head of the theological structure of the Umbrians, for in the Iguvine Tables Jupiter, Mars, and Vofionus share the distinctive surname of Grabovius.

This balance sheet, completed (*Wiss.*, pp. 133-34) by a circumstance related to the cult of *Fides*, is rather summary and must be corrected at some points, but it stands. One cannot fail to be astonished that the man who drew it up and who wrote, with regard to the Iguvine triad, the important word *Göttersystem* "theological structure," should later have studied the three Roman gods separately, without troubling himself over their interrelationships or over the meaning of the *System* which he had glimpsed, at Rome and Iguvium. Since 1912 the exegetes of Roman religion have not paid it much attention. Only in recent times has it given rise to two radically opposed conceptions. One of these is expressed in the series to which I have given the common title *Jupiter Mars Quirinus* (1941-48); the other, coming as a reaction by various authors, is most notably set forth in Kurt Latte's *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (1960), which has recently replaced Wissowa's book in the *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*. In short, while it seems necessary to me to use this triad as a point of departure for the understanding of the oldest Roman religion, Latte fails to see in it anything but a late and accidental and, moreover, badly documented grouping. One seeks in vain in his manual for a discussion of the question. The Umbrian parallel is nowhere mentioned. The other elements of the dossier occur in scattered notes, each fact being examined as if the others did not exist, in connection with some other subject, and without reference to the triad. Each of these investigations, with only one isolated and therefore unimportant exception,

has as its end result the depreciation or elimination of the evidence. Thus, before we reflect on the meaning of the triad, we must put to the philological proof the documents which establish its existence and which the latest criticism tries to deny.

Two of these documents have already been thoroughly examined in my "Preliminary Remarks," for the sake of the problems of method which they raise.

1. Concerning the *ordo sacerdotum*, which Latte discusses on pages 37 and 195 of his book, I have demonstrated³ that it is not possible to set the date of its establishment as late as the second half of the fourth century, or to explain the "selection" of the three flamens called *maiores* as one of the historical accidents of this period. I shall confine myself to quoting the text of Festus in which the *ordo* is set forth (pp. 299-300 L²):

It is the *rex* who is regarded as the greatest (of these priests), then comes the *flamen Dialis*, after him the *Martialis*, in fourth place the *Quirinalis*, and in fifth the *pontifex maximus*. Consequently, at a feast the *rex* sits above all the priests; the *Dialis* above the *Martialis* and the *Quirinalis*; the *Martialis* above the latter, and both above the *pontifex*: the *rex* because he is the most powerful; the *Dialis* because he is the priest of the universe which is called *dium*; the *Martialis* because Mars is the father of the founder of Rome; the *Quirinalis* because Quirinus was summoned from Cures to be associated with the Roman empire; and the *pontifex maximus* because he is the judge and arbiter of the affairs of gods and men.

We are concerned here only with the fact of the hierarchy, not with the reasons by which Festus justifies it. Note that the explanations of the *Martialis* and the *Quirinalis* are based on the commonly accepted version of the "history" of the origins. Let us merely add that Latte, in order to reduce the importance of the evidence, stresses that the precedences of the five priests are indicated only on the occasion of banquets. Is it not unlikely, however, that the order of precedence at banquets should have been different from that observed at other gatherings? In addition, as concerns the three flamens, it is less the order of the priests than that of their gods which is given, and this order is constant in all the other testimonies.

2. The formula of *deuotio* (Liv. 8.9.8), in which, after Janus, the gods of the major flamens are invoked, has been quoted in full

3. Above, pp. 102-3.

above.⁴ It has been shown that the two reasons offered by Latte (p. 5, n. 1) for regarding this formula as a forgery do not prove his thesis: *fero*, in the phrase *ueniam peto feroque*, does not have the meaning he assigns to it; and the order of enumeration, with the *diui Nouensiles* in first place and the *dii Indigetes* in second, which seems to contradict the meaning then ascribed to the two words, actually confirms that the historian correctly copied an authentic formula.

3. One of the two competing traditions concerning the *spolia opima*, the one which is generally agreed to be the most ancient, lists as their recipients, respectively, Jupiter (of the *prima*), Mars (of the *secunda*), and Quirinus (of the *tertia*): thus Varro (in Fest. p. 302 L²) and Servius (*Aen.* 6.859). This piece of information is the only one accepted by the latest critic. Thus it is enough merely to mention it here. Later it will provide useful facts for the interpretation of the triad.⁵

* 4. Once a year, "the flamens" went to sacrifice at the chapel of Fides, under very special conditions.⁶ Livy attributes the establishment of the rites to Numa, who was, according to general opinion, the founder of all the *sacra*. He describes them as follows: "He also established an annual worship of Faith, to whose chapel he ordered that the flamens should proceed in a two-horse hooded carriage, and that they should offer the sacrifice with their right hands wrapped up as far as the fingers."

Until recent years, making allowance for the context, flamens had been understood here to designate the three *flamines maiores*, those of Jupiter, Mars, and Quirinus. In fact, Livy's account occurs in his enumeration of the religious ceremonies instituted by the legendary King Numa (1.20-21). First he speaks of the creation of the priests, the first of whom are correctly and conjointly the three *flamines maiores* (20.1-2), followed by the Vestals, then the *Salii*, and finally the pontiffs (20.3-7). After reflections concerning the happy effect on the Romans of these institutions (21.1-2), and a mention of his supposed counsellor,

4. Above, p. 103.

5. Below, pp. 172-73.

6. See now the articles of P. Boyancé: "Fides et le serment," *Coll. Lat.* 58 (*Hommages à A. Grenier*) (1962): 329-41; "Fides Romana et la vie internationale," *Institut de France, Séance publique des cinq Académies* 25 October 1962, pp. 1-16; "Les Romains, peuple de la fides," *LH* 23 (1964): 419-35. See also L. Lombardi, *Dalla "fides" alla "bona fides"* (1961); and V. Bellini, "Deditio in fidem," *Revue historique du droit français et étranger* 42 (1964): 448-57, especially as a means of creating a connection of the *cliens/patronus* type. Detailed bibliography in Catalano, *SSR*, p. 81, n. 31, and in J. P. Boucher, *Etudes sur Properce* (1965), pp. 485-87.

the nymph Egeria (21.3), the historian proceeds to the sacrifices and ceremonies invented by Numa (21.4-5), and the sacrifice to Fides heads the list. It is thus natural to think that in this text, where everything is precise and technical, the *flamines* who appear in 21.4 are the ones—the only ones—who have been involved up to that point, and that they are the ones who are named in 20.1-2, the three *maiores*. Such is the general opinion, shared, for example, by Otto in his article “Fides” in the *RE* (6 [1909], col. 2292, lines 5-14): “From the cult of Fides an ancient and very remarkable ritual has been handed down to us. . . . The three great flamens drove to her sanctuary in a covered vehicle drawn by two horses”; such also is Wissowa’s opinion (1902, p. 123; 1912, pp. 133-34): “In fact, the cult itself is certainly more ancient than the establishment of the temple [of Fides, around 250, on the Capitol], since we know that the three flamens proceeded once a year to the sanctuary of Fides (the one which had preceded the Capitoline temple) in a covered vehicle, and offered her a sacrifice. . . .”

In note 4 on page 237 of his book, without mentioning the current opinion, Latte offers as self-evident another interpretation of the word *flamines*, intended to destroy the evidence: “Livy uses *flamines*, in accordance with the linguistic usage of his time, without technical force, to mean *sacerdotes*; from this it does not follow that Fides has a special flaminatus.” If the final remark is certainly true (but who ever intimated that there was a flamen of Fides?), the suggestion which precedes it is doubly improbable. We have just seen that the style and intention of the historian’s chapters 20-21 dissuade us from supposing an “untechnisch” use of *flamen* (a use which does not seem to occur in Livy),⁷ and that the coherent plan of these same chapters suggests, on the contrary, that we clarify 21.4 by means of 20.1-2. On the other hand, if we understand the word as Latte proposes, the plural *flamines* at 21.4 is not justified. Livy had no reason to evoke in this sentence a succession through the ages of single, individual titularies of a particular priesthood of Fides,⁸ the only use of the plural which would agree with usage,⁹ and accordingly *flamines* here must

7. A few chapters further on, while discussing Ancus, Livy writes (1.33.1): *Ancus, demandata cura sacrorum flaminibus sacerdotibusque aliis . . .*

8. However, this is just what Latte does (p. 237, n. 4), when he boldly translates *flamines* by a singular: “Wir erfahren, dass ihr der Priester einmal im Jahr . . . ein Opfer brachte.”

9. This is how the plural is justified in texts like Gaius 1.112 (*flamines maiores, id est Diales Martiales Quirinales, item reges sacrorum . . .*): Gaius is considering these priests throughout history; similarly *Dialibus* in Tac. *Ann.* 3.71.4; etc.

refer to a group of priests, all of whom are present and active at the same time. Are we then to suppose that Fides was served by a sodality which has left no other traces?

5. Servius (*Aen.* 8.663) says that the Salii, the priests who used in their ceremonies the *ancilia*, the buckler which fell from heaven and its eleven indistinguishable copies, are in *tutela Iouis Martis Quirini*.

This statement does not depend on the text of Virgil with which it is associated, and is not suggested by it. Servius has thus given us here an independent note, and one which contains no surprises, since each of the three gods does in fact have a personal connection with the Salii. If, according to the legend of the foundation, it was Jupiter who caused the *ancile* to fall from heaven, it is Mars and Quirinus who respectively patronize the two teams of priests throughout history. The form in which we know the legend of the foundation is apparently recent and shows Greek influence, but the *ancilia* themselves are ancient, probably not having in the first centuries of Rome the connotation of *pignora imperii*, but rather that of talismans of annual security. What god other than the sovereign Jupiter was qualified to give such talismans to the community? And what other god was more able to make an object fall from the sky? As for the attribution of one of the colleges of Salii to Mars and of the other to Quirinus, whatever its meaning may be, it is definite. Nobody rejects the former, and the latter is no less well attested, despite what Latte writes (p. 113, n. 3): "The attestation is weak: a discourse in Livy, 5.52.7, and a somewhat distorted reference by Statius, *Silv.* 5.2.129." Not to mention the poet's text, which is not negligible,¹⁰ it is hard to see how the fact that the historian's text occurs in a "discourse" and not in the body of the

10. R. Schilling, "Janus, le dieu introducteur, le dieu des passages," *MEFR*, 1960, p. 123, n. 4, writes: "Let us note that the meaning of this opposition [Quirinus-peace, Mars-war, see below, pp. 259-61] was never lost. When Statius (*S.* 5.128 ff.) composes a poem in honor of Crispinus, who is a 'Salian of the Hill,' he distributes the roles vested in Mars and Quirinus in conformity with tradition: to Mars (and Athena) the art of battle, to Quirinus the defensive arms:

*Monstrabunt acies Mauors Actaeaque uirgo
... umeris quater arma Quirinus
qui tibi tam tenero permisit plaudere collo
nubigenas clipeos intactaque caedibus arma.*

The last line designates the *ancilia* and the javelins used to strike them: observe the stress of *intacta caedibus arma*." It is possible that this last expression alludes solely to the fact that the arms of the Salii were used only in rites, not in war. In any case, this text proves definitely that the Salii *Collini* belonged to Quirinus.

narrative diminishes its credibility. Whether *contio* or *narratio*, everything that appears in Livy is by Livy, and is equally based on the information available to Livy. Moreover, it is not true that we have no other evidence. When Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who says in another place that the *Salii Palatini* belong only to Mars (fragment 14.2.2: καλίας τις Ἀρεος, designating the *sacrarium Saliorum* on the Palatine; cf. Val. Max. 1.8.11), undertakes (2.70.2) to present conjointly the *Salii Palatini* and the *Salii Agonenses* or *Collini*, he defines them as “dancers and singers of the armed gods [τῶν ἐνοπλίων θεῶν].” These armed gods, in the plural, are obviously not Mars alone, but Mars and Quirinus, the two gods whom the same historian, through an inadequate interpretation of Quirinus but one normal at this period, combines elsewhere (2.48.2) under the common epithet “warrior divinities [δαιμόνων πολεμιστῶν].”

Apart from any interpretation, and considering only the Roman data, the verdict rendered by Latte in the last words of note 3 on page 113 is arbitrary: “*Serv. Aen.* 8.663, *Salios qui sunt in tutela Iouis Martis Quirini* is surely false [ist sicher falsch].” However we are to understand the concept of *tutela*, the rites and the instruments of the *Salii* still involve the three gods.¹¹

The Jupiter-Mars-Quirinus triad is thus not illusory, and the documents which attest it are valid.¹² How are we to interpret it?

11. Latte also refuses to admit that the *Salii* are priests (pp. 115, 120); let us define them, if he prefers, as men who specialized in certain religious functions.

12. It will have been noted that none of the testimonies implies that Quirinus is identified with Romulus, which is contrary to Latte's thesis discussed above, pp. 106-7.

2

INTERPRETATION: THE THREE FUNCTIONS

For as long as people have been willing to discuss it, the pre-Capitoline triad has been generally regarded as the result of Rome's precocious history.

Giving a liberal interpretation to the classic legends about the origins of the city, holding especially to the idea of synoecism, of the fusion of two ethnically different populations, Latin and Sabine, certain scholars have admitted, in agreement with one of the two variants, that Quirinus was the god of the Sabine component, a kind of Sabine Mars, who was juxtaposed with the Latin Mars, and that Jupiter, who was shared by the two nations, was diplomatically placed at the head of this compromise. In the course of my "Preliminary Remarks," the weakness of this Sabine thesis is emphasized.¹ It is sufficient to add here that the variant which assigns Quirinus to the Sabines is obviously based on an etymological approximation, a connection with the name of the Sabine city of Cures, which the linguists have been unable to confirm.

Abandoning the Sabine component and ethnic considerations in general, others support the idea of original dualism by basing it on topographical considerations. The population of the *collis Quirinalis*, whatever it was and wherever it came from, had Quirinus as its principal god, as the populations of the Palatine had Mars, and it was the joining of these originally independent settlers in a unified city which brought about the juxtaposition of the local gods, Quirinus and Mars, in the pantheon. But as we saw in the "Preliminary Remarks," if the name *collis Quirinalis* actually means "the hill of Quirinus," there is no proof that this denomination antedates the synoecism—or, to be

1. Above, pp. 60-78.

more prudent, let us say the absorption of the *collis* into the *urbs*—and it is possible as well that a “Palatine” god named Quirinus may have seen his cult transferred to this northern outpost, just as the “Palatine” Jupiter was put in possession of the Capitol. In reality, there is no free choice between these theoretically possible theses. The interpretation of Quirinus as a primitive local god collides with a massive fact which condemns any attempt to explain the triad in terms borrowed from the history or the location of Rome, and which, consequently, the authors of these attempts refrain from mentioning. This fact is the existence among the Umbrians of Iguvium, whose pantheon is partially known to us through the famous *Tabulae*, of a completely similar triad.² Three gods also appear there, whose grouping in an organic structure proceeds both from their common and exclusive epithet, *Grabouio*,³ and from the three parallel rituals in which they figure. These gods, in order, are *Jou-*, *Mart-*, and *Vofiono-*, and their succession, to judge from one important detail, is truly a hierarchy: if each of these gods receives as a sacrifice, with the same ceremonial, three cattle (with the offering to the third specified as *buf trif calersu* “tres boues callidos,” that is, with white forehead or face and the rest of the body of another color), in contrast the minor gods who are attached to them receive unequal victims: respectively, three pregnant sows, three suckling pigs, and three lambs. At Rome, in the theory of the consecration of the *spolia opima*, it is notable that the only liturgical circumstance in which we hear of different victims being offered to Jupiter, Mars, and Quirinus, that of Quirinus is an *agnus mas* (as opposed to a *bos* for Jupiter and the *solitaurilia* = *suouetaurilia* for Mars).⁴ Finally, the comparison of the three names at Iguvium with those at Rome brings out a remarkable fact: while

2. See my “Remarques sur les dieux Grabovio- d'Iguvium,” *RPh* 28 (1954): 225–34, reprinted, with many changes, as *IR*, part II, chap. 2; “Notes sur le début du rituel d'Iguvium (E. Vetter, *Handbuch* . . . 1, 1953, pp. 171–79),” *RHR* 147 (1955): 265–67. See especially I. Rosenzweig, *Ritual and Cults of Pre-Roman Iguvium* (1937); cf. R. Bloch, “Parenté entre religion de Rome et religion d'Ombrie, thèmes de recherches,” *REL* 41 (1963): 115–22. Bibliography of the Tables (notably editions and translations of G. Devoto, E. Vetter, V. Pisani, G. Bottiglioni, J. W. Poultney), most recently in A. Ernout, *Le dialecte ombrien* (1961), pp. 5–6 (pp. 14–47, text and Latin translation of the Tables); cf. A. J. Pfiffig, *Religio Iguvina* (1964), pp. 11–31, text and German translation, followed by a most astonishing commentary: the author is one of those who understand Etruscan.

3. On *Grabouio*, see G. Garbini, *Studi linguistici in onore di V. Pisani* (1969), pp. 391–400 (“Grabovius”).

4. Below, p. 240.

Jou- and *Mart-*, shared by the two lists, are substantives, the third god is designated in both places by an adjective, a derivative in *-no* of a nominal stem.⁵ These facts are enough to establish that the two lists are not separable. And this statement has an important consequence.

Neither form of the divine grouping can be the outcome of chance, a historical accident.⁶ It is unlikely, for example, that a fusion of inhabitants into a unified whole under different circumstances and with necessarily very different components, should twice have produced, independently, the same religious compromise, expressed in two divine hierarchies which resemble each other so closely. Thus it is certainly a question of a grouping of gods antedating the foundation both of Iguvium and of Rome, imported and maintained by the two groups of founders and inherited from their common past.

If the explanation of the grouping is neither local nor historical, it can only be of another kind. The grouping is meaningful; it outlines by the association of three different and hierarchized divine types a religious conception in three stages. In short, it constitutes a theological structure, and is indeed, as Wissowa said, a *Göttersystem* and not merely a *Götterversammlung*. It is this structure which we must try to understand.

Finally, since we are concerned with a pre-Roman and pre-Umbrian structure, and hence one which was inherited from a stage nearer to the Indo-European unity than is Rome, there will be occasion to compare it with what is known of the oldest theological structures of the other Indo-European peoples. To reject this help, as several specialists do, cannot be justified by any reason of fact or of principle: the "Preliminary Remarks" of the present volume illustrate its possibility and its usefulness. Naturally, however, it is on the basis of the Roman data that the interpretation must be formed, with the comparison providing aid and control on delicate points and giving to the whole its true dimensions.

5. V. Pisani, "Mytho-Etymologica," *Rev. des études indo-européennes* (Bucharest) 1 (1938): 230-33, and, independently, E. Benveniste, "Symbolisme social dans les cultes gréco-italiques," *RHR* 129 (1945): 7-9, propose a very probable etymology for *Vofiono-*, which makes it the exact equivalent of **Couirio-no-*: **Leudhyo-no-*. The phonetic correspondences (*l*, *eu*, *dh* > *u*, *o*, *f*) are entirely regular; for **leudhyo-*, cf. German *Leute*, etc. Other etymologies of *Vofiono-* are not very likely: see my "Remarques . . ." (above, n. 2), p. 226, n. 1.

6. And borrowing is evidently excluded. A detailed discussion appears in my article, "A Propos de Quirinus," *REL* 33 (1955): 105-8.

Which Roman data are we to use in this investigation? We shall gradually have to bring in the entire theology of the three gods, as well as their history. For they do have a history. If Mars shows scarcely any development, the Capitoline Jupiter, whose cult was established during the articulation of the *regnum* and the *libertas*, is in certain respects a new type. As for Quirinus, his identification with Romulus in the account of the origins has certainly altered and complicated his definition. To be sure, we must not exaggerate these changes, and we shall see that the Capitoline god preserved a great deal, and, as the identification of Quirinus with Romulus cannot have been entirely arbitrary, the very changes which it produced are apt to reveal the ancient traits of the figures involved. But, for the specific problem in which we are engaged, we must be exacting and must limit ourselves at first to what is taught by the behavior of the three flamens of these gods. On the one hand, as I have said more than once, these *maiores* priests are in fact true fossils, stubbornly resisting change; in the historical period, not one of them was ever charged with new duties; their number never varied, and their archaic nature is obvious (the rules of the *Dialis*; the *Martialis* and the sacrifice of the October Horse). On the other hand, they themselves form, in the *ordo* and in the cult of Fides, a human triad in which the differential characteristics must not be divorced from those which distinguish the divine triad: At the most, certain social or political facts of the regal period can be connected with this first piece of evidence.

The status of the *flamen Dialis* and of his wife, the *flaminica*, is the best known of the three: containing a great number of strange items, it has interested the antiquaries and the annalists.⁷ A certain number of these items are intended solely to assure the continued presence of the priest in Rome and his physical communication with Roman soil (he may not leave Rome; the feet of his bed are coated with a thin layer of mud, and he may not go three days without lying on it), but others clarify the nature of his god.

Certain items refer to the sky, attesting that Jupiter is in the heavens. For example, the *flamen Dialis* may remove his under tunic only in covered places, in order that he may not appear naked under the

7. Unless otherwise indicated, the data given here occur in Gell. 10.15, *de flaminis Dialis deque flaminicae caerimoniis*.

sky *tanquam sub oculis Jouis*. Again, he is not allowed to remove *sub diuo* the most distinctive part of his costume, the *apex* of his cap. Moreover, it must be admitted that at all times the sky god was the hurler of thunderbolts; if there is nothing in what we know of the behavior of the *Dialis* which corresponds to this trait, that of his wife fills the gap: when she sees a thunderbolt, the *flaminica* is *feriata* "until she shall have appeased the gods" (Macr. 1.16.8).

But this naturalistic aspect is not the only one. The connections of the *flamen Dialis* and the *rex*, which have already been mentioned, are definite, and must date from earlier than republican times. Livy explains their principle, evidently based on the pontifical doctrine, in his chapter on the alleged foundations by Numa, where he sums up so well the essential features of each priest (1.20. 1-2):

He [Numa] then turned his attention to the appointment of priests, although he performed very many priestly duties himself, especially those which now belong to the *Flamen Dialis*. But inasmuch as he thought that in a warlike nation there would be more kings like Romulus than like Numa, and that they would take the field in person, he did not wish the sacrificial duties of the kingly office to be neglected, and so appointed a *flamen* for Jupiter, as his perpetual priest, and provided him with a conspicuous dress and the royal curule chair. To him he added two other *flamens*, one for Mars, the other for Quirinus.

The curule chair was not the unique sign of a mystical link with power: the only one of the priests with the Vestals, the *flamen Dialis* was preceded by one lictor (Plut. Q.R. 113), and he alone had the privilege of sitting in the Senate (Liv. 27.8.8).⁸ Through these definitions and symbols we catch sight of a characteristic of the earliest Jupiter: he himself was *rex*, and he protected the human *rex*. Even in republican times, when this title had become suspect and hateful, it remained *fas* to give it to Jupiter, and to him alone (Cic. Rep. 1.50; Liv 3.39.4).

Other rules governing the *flamen Dialis* (principally Gell. 10.15), the most likely interpretation of which is that they extend to the priest the traits of his god, reveal a Jupiter who is above the oath, above the law, completely free. Alone of the Romans, the *flamen Dialis* is

8. The *flaminica* and the *regina* are the only ones to wear the headdress called (in) *arculum*, Serv. Aen. 4.137; cf. Paul. p. 237 L².

exempt from the oath, *iurare Dialei fas nunquam est*. By virtue of his position he suspends the execution of punishments: if a chained man enters his house, he must be set free, and the chains must be carried up to the roof and thrown down from there into the street; if a man who is being led away to be scourged casts himself in supplication at the feet of the *Dialis*, it is a sacrilege to beat him on that day. A personal symbolism confirms this freedom, this absence of ties: the *Dialis* has no knot on his cap or on his girdle or elsewhere; he may not even wear a ring which is not open and hollow.

Differentially, other rules separate him clearly from the warlike area of human activity. He may not see the army, *classem procinctam*, arrayed outside the *pomerium*. The horse is particularly repugnant to him: he must not mount it.

Finally, another group of rules makes the *Dialis* the pure and sacred being par excellence, the incarnation of the sacred. He is *quotidie feriatius*, which means that for him no day is secular. Day and night he keeps on his person some item of costume which expresses his function. No fire but the sacred fire may be carried out of his house. He must always have near his bedposts a casket containing sacred cakes, *strues* and *ferctum*. The most sacred of the marriage forms, the *confarreatio*, besides being demanded of him and his parents, also requires his presence. He avoids contact with everything which may defile, and especially with that which is dead or suggests death: corpses, funeral pyres, and uncooked meat.⁹

Thus, the already complex figure of a personal god emerges at the head of the triad: celestial and fulgurant, but also kingly; active in the areas of power and the law, but not of battle, which, like the horse, is Mars's concern; the most sacred among sacred beings and the source of sacredness. It would be artificial to try to assign a chronological order to the elements of this coherent representation; particularly artificial to claim that in the beginnings this god was merely a Jupiter of the peasants, the master of good and bad weather and the sender of rain, and to assert that the rest of his qualities were later additions. The *regnum*, as we have seen, is also very old, older than Rome, and the functional pair *rex-flamen Dialis* has its counterparts in Ireland as well as in India.¹⁰ Frazer too drastically reduced the Latin

9. On the role of the *flamen Dialis* at the August Vinalia, see below, pp. 184-85.

10. Above, pp. 16-17.

rex to magico-agricultural duties, and to the role of guarantor of fertility; he was the leader in all things, primarily in the political area, and in earlier times, without doubt, in the religious area: these are the parts of the royal function which Jupiter controlled in the visible world and discharged himself in the invisible world.

We know little about the *flamen Martialis*; he was not involved in a maze of interdictions and obligations, like the *Dialis*, and this was probably an essential part of his nature rather than the result of a slackening of rules. He would not have fulfilled his true function if he had been subjected to rules which had meaning only in the theology of Jupiter.¹¹ We have no direct knowledge of any of his sacred duties. Nevertheless it is very probable that he was active in a ceremony which goes back to the earliest times and which definitely characterizes the earliest Mars: the sacrifice of a horse to this god, performed on 15 October, on the Field of Mars. If the summary information which we have concerning the *Equus October* does not actually specify the officiating priest, a macabre imitation of it, which was performed in Caesar's time, in which two mutinous soldiers took the place of the horse, was carried out, according to Dio Cassius (43.24.4) "by the pontiffs and the priest of Mars." Later we shall have to examine this ceremony in detail, or at least what incomplete sources tell us about it,¹² but here the only important thing is the character of the ritual act in which the *flamen Martialis* participated. This character is clearly warlike. The victim is a "war horse," ἵππος πολεμιστής, and moreover has just been the "winner"

11. Serv. Aen. 8. 552: *more enim uetere sacrorum neque Martialis neque Quirinalis omnibus caerimoniis tenebantur quibus flamen Dialis*. If the *flamen Martialis* may mount a horse (ibid.), it is not because of a relaxation of his statute, but because the horse belongs to the domain of Mars (below, p. 216). That the position proper to the *Martialis* was rather strict appears, for example, in Val. Max. 1.1.2, where we see a grand pontiff preventing a consul who is at the same time a *flamen* of Mars from going to war in Africa, *ne a sacris discederet*; but the *caerimoniae Martiae* which required his presence are not known.

12. Below, pp. 215-28, and "QII 17 (Le 'sacrifice humain' de 46 av. J. C.)," REL 41 (1963): 87-89. There is no doubt that the manner of execution was taken from the October Horse (it too was performed on the Field of Mars, and the heads were also carried to the Regia); moreover, Dio Cassius specifies that the execution was performed in the manner of a religious ritual ἐν τρόπῳ τινὶ ἱερουργίας. It is certainly to the *Equus October*, the only sacrifice of a horse at Rome, that Pliny refers, N.H. 28.146: horse's gall, he says, is regarded as a poison; ideo flamine sacrorum equum tangere non licet, cum Romae publicis sacris equus etiam immolatur; the *flamen* here must be the *Martialis*, and the method of killing (by thrusts of a javelin) allowed him to sacrifice the animal without touching it.

in a race, ὁ νικήσας δεξιός, and it is not immolated with a knife but with the thrust of a javelin *κατάκοντίζειν* (Pol. 12.4b).¹³

The role attributed to Mars in the royal legends allows us to glimpse what his place in the ideology then was, his point of entry into the social order. Even though he may be the father of the founding twins he does not at any point act in association with the monarchy. It is not to Mars but to Jupiter that his son Romulus trusts the protection of his work. If it is said of Numa that he created the flamen of Mars and his group of Salii, this is not an indication of affinity but merely the result of the bias which attributes to this king the establishment of all the great priesthoods. During the monarchy he does not play a significant role, but at the end, with the expulsion of the Tarquins and the establishment of the Republic, he is abruptly thrust into the place of honor. The oath normally belongs in Jupiter's province; however, in the annalistic tradition when Brutus, *tribunus Celerum*, that is, the leader of the army, swears to avenge the rape of Lucretia by expelling the kings, it is Mars whom he invokes; and the fallen king's land lying along the Tiber is consecrated to Mars, receiving the name of *campus Martius*. One has the impression, in this insurrection of the Latin military aristocracy against the Etruscan kings and in general against the *regnum*, that Mars is ideologically opposed to the traditional Jupiter, whom the Capitoline dedication has not yet reconciled, on approval, with the *libertas*.

With regard to the first two gods of the triad, we see that the collection of the oldest facts already sets the general tone for what they will continue to be throughout all of Roman history, despite inevitable adaptations to changing circumstances. Even when he assumes military tasks on the Capitol, the celestial and fulgurant Jupiter will be for the consuls and for the state the ruler and the resource which he was for the king, and, with the features of Zeus,

13. In his inaugural lecture at the Collège de France, 4 December, 1945, p. 12 (*Philologica* 1, [1946]: 10), A. Ernout ingeniously attributed another, nonwarlike duty to the *flamen Martialis*: "... Such was this distich which the *flamen Martialis* pronounced on the day of the Meditrinalia, a feast in honor of Meditrina 'the healing <goddess>,' in order to dispel illness: *Nouum uetus uinum bibo | nouo uteri morbo medeor* (Varro L.L. 6.21)." I do not believe that this can be deduced from the text: *Octobri mense Meditrinalia dies dictus a medendo, quod Flaccus flamen Martialis dicebat, hoc die solitum uinum nouum et uetus libari et degustari medicamenti causa; quod facere solent etiam nunc multi quum dicant: nouum uetus uinum bibo*, etc. Flaccus, the flamen of Mars, is thus only the source of the information. Ernout maintains this interpretation in his edition of Pliny, *N.H.* 28 (1962), p. 125, n. 4.

he will still remain the most august of the divinities. Mars will always patronize physical force and the spiritual violence whose principal application is war and whose outcome is victory. The career of Quirinus has been less straightforward. What do we learn from the observation of his priest?

We know three circumstances, and only three, in which the *flamen Quirinalis* participated ritually: at the time of the summer Consualia (21 August), at the time of the Robigalia (25 April), and probably at the time of the Larentalia (23 December). Until quite recent times, they had scarcely been doubted. G. Wissowa, who usually had better inspiration, had been the only one to think that they were secondary (p. 155): the meaning and the function of the god having been forgotten, he says, his priest had become idle, and in order to provide employment for this priest he had been given new duties, unconnected with those which he formerly performed and which had also been forgotten. This thesis is definitely untenable. The Romans never treated the traditional priests in this way, particularly not the other major flamens. When the meaning of a priesthood became blurred, along with the theology which supported it, they allowed it to fade away, preserving its honors, and created new priests in order to fill new needs. Moreover, several of the divinities served by the *flamen Quirinalis* are among the most archaic. The name of Consus, among others, bears the mark of great antiquity. Finally, considering the realities of Rome, it is hard to imagine the shift of these few old cults without priests to an old priest without a cult, which Wissowa conjectures. At least Wissowa does not question the facts of the problem. On the contrary, this is exactly what Latte does. Let us consider them in succession, saving the case of the Larentalia for another occasion, since it involves a particular difficulty; however, if it is to be retained, as probably it should be, it can only confirm the other facts.¹⁴

The calendar contains two feasts of Consus, the god of stored grains (*condere*), on 21 August and 15 December; each is followed, after a similar interval (25 August and 19 December), by a feast of the goddess Ops, the personification of abundance and, in the earliest times especially, of agricultural abundance. This arrangement proves a con-

14. See below, pp. 268-69.

nection between the two divinities, which is not at all surprising and which confirms the epithet of Ops in the August cult: *Consuina*.¹⁵ As so often happens, we have scanty information concerning the details of the rites. In the case of the Opeconsivia of 25 August, it can be thought that the grand pontiff and the Vestals officiated, but this is only an inference: all that is said in the only text (Varr. *L.L.* 6.21) which speaks of Ops Consiva is that she had a sanctuary in the Regia of the Forum, so sacred that the only ones allowed to enter it were the Vestals and the grand pontiff, who is designated as usual by the phrase *sacerdos publicus*. As for the Consualia of 21 August, an equally unique text (Tert. *Spect.* 5) says plainly that on this day the *flamen Quirinalis* and the Vestal virgins sacrificed at the underground altar which Consus had in the Circus. The two operations are different, and, if the Vestals take part in both—as they definitely do in the Consualia and as they probably do in the feast of Ops Consiva—it is because the two divinities are strictly interdependent and because the affinity of the priestesses for one also involves an affinity for the other. Latte, however, shows no hesitation in setting aside Tertullian's testimony, on the pretext of an alleged "confusion" committed by Tertullian with regard to Consus—a confusion of which in fact he is not guilty.¹⁶ The Christian doctor is then supposed to have made mistake after mistake, and, not being aware of anything but the *opeconsuia dies* of 25 August, to have replaced 25 August by 21 August, the Forum and the Regia by the Circus, Ops by Consus, and finally—one wonders how and why, since the *pontifex* was surely the *mentio facilior*—the grand pontiff by the *flamen* of Quirinus. The rite of 21 August, expressly affirmed in this text, is thus evaporated to the advantage of the rite of 25 August, which is itself only a reconstruction. If one is not determined in advance to destroy the dossier of the *flamen Quirinalis* item by item, is it not wiser to accept that which is not suspicious, and to continue to think that 21 August, the feast of Consus, had its

15. The connection established by the ferial between Consus and the agricultural Abundance is confirmed by the fact that Consus is one of the old divinities (Seia, Segeta, etc.) of the valley of the Circus, all of them agrarian. The best etymology of his name is still the one which connects it with *condere*. The form *Consualia* may be analogical (*Februalia*, etc.), or it may be based on a verbal substantive in -u; there is nothing in it to suggest an Etruscan origin. Contrary opinion in A. Ernout, *Philologica* 2, (1957): 174. See below, pp. 267–68.

16. "Religion romaine et critique philologique, 2, le *flamen Quirinalis* aux *Consualia*," *REL* 39 (1961): 91–93.

rites at the altar of Consus, that 25 August, the feast of Ops, had its rites in the sanctuary of Ops, and that it was the *flamen Quirinalis* who celebrated the former?

The Robigalia involve the sacrifice of a dog and a sheep to Robigus, the personification of wheat rust. This is one of the rare malevolent powers to receive a cult. According to the calendar of Praeneste (CIL, I², 316-17), the feast takes place near the fifth milestone on the Via Claudia. Ovid, who uses poetic license when he names the divinity "Robigo" as the blight itself, is the only one to speak of a *lucus* consecrated to this spirit, and he says that he met the celebrants of the feast when he was returning from Nomentum. This scarcely agrees with the localization given by the calendar, since the traveler coming from Nomentum returns to Rome by the *via Nomentana* and not by the *via Claudia*. From Mommsen (who cites Ov. Pont. 1.8.43-44) to Bömer (*Fast.* 2: 287), various plausible ways of reconciling these two statements have been proposed, and of course it is possible, after all, that Ovid was guilty of an oversight on this point. But it is scarcely thinkable that he was mistaken about the salient features in the ceremony: on the one hand, the nature of the victims, of which one, the dog, is unusual, and on the other hand, the sacrificing priest. This priest is the *flamen Quirinalis*, into whose mouth the poet puts a long prayer consistent with a conception of Quirinus which was particularly cultivated by Augustan propaganda, and which we shall examine later: that of a peaceable Quirinus. Latte's judgment here seems to hesitate. On page 67 he does not contest the presence of the priest: "At the fifth milestone of the Via Claudia the *flamen Quirinalis* sacrifices a sheep and a dog"; but on page 114, note 1, he decides on the other hand that Ovid's uncertainty regarding the name (*Robigo* instead of *Robigus*) and the difficulties of itinerary caused by the mention of Nomentum completely invalidate his testimony concerning the priest. This is to mix up the incidental detail, in which the poet has taken one or perhaps two small liberties, and the essential fact, in which he could not commit an error without destroying the interest and the usefulness of the whole passage.

Even though the presence of his flamen there is not affirmed, we must cite here the festival of Quirinus himself, the Quirinalia of 17 February, which belong to the most ancient known cycle of annual ceremonies. The only ritual which is indicated for this day is the one

which bears the name of *stultorum feriae*, the last part of the Fornacalia (Ov. F. 2.513-32).¹⁷ The Fornacalia, the feast of the roasting of grains, were celebrated separately by each of the thirty curiae, but not on a fixed date, which explains the absence of the name in the calendars. Each year the *Curio maximus* decided the days and posted them in the Forum. But there were laggards—the *stulti*—who through carelessness or ignorance allowed the day assigned to their curia to pass. On 17 February they had a “day of catching-up” on which, as a group, they were supposed to set themselves aright. What is the connection between the “feast of fools” and the Quirinalia? Is it a simple coincidence of two independent rituals on the same day? Or were they even identical? This latter view is represented by Festus, p. 412 (cf. p. 361) L², and by the eighty-ninth *Roman Question* of Plutarch, and two reasons recommend it. First, there is the fact that if the Quirinalia are not the feast of fools, no Roman writer and no antiquary has given the slightest indication regarding their content; but rituals just do not disappear so completely; on the contrary, at Rome they often survive the loss of their theological justification. Second—but this will not take on interest until after our next considerations of the very meaning of the name of Quirinus—there is the fact that the feast of fools concludes operations which fully involve the structure of the *curiae*, under the authority of the *Curio maximus*. I do not think, therefore, that Latte is correct when he writes (p. 113): “The feast of the Quirinalia, on 17 February, was later so completely forgotten that the final ceremony of the Fornacalia, the *stultorum feriae*, could be set on this day.” This is to attribute to the Romans responsible for theology and especially for the cult more freedom than they acknowledged to themselves; moreover, how are we to understand the word “later”? Do not the Fornacalia and their conclusion furnish, in their subject matter and in their curiate organization, the guarantee of their antiquity?

17. On the Fornacalia, see L. Delatte, *Recherches sur quelques fêtes mobiles du calendrier romain* (1937), pp. 13-22. The character of “god of the dead” which some have tried to draw from the date of the Quirinalia (H. Wagenvoort, *Studies in Roman Literature, Culture, and Religion* [1956], p. 182) is not supported by the facts. Only the calendar of Pomerius Silvius places the death of Romulus on 17 February (Quirinalia, *quo die Romulus occisus a suis*); all the other sources associate this legend with 7 July (*Nonae Caprotinae*). Ovid, F. 2.481-512, speaks of the transformation of Romulus into Quirinus at the beginning of his treatment of the Quirinalia, but leaves it associated with *Capreae Palus*, thus with the *Nonae Caprotinae* of July.

A sensible consideration is enough to render improbable the disqualifications, in the dossier of Quirinus, of the offices of his flamen and the content of his festival: if the duties of the *flamen Quirinalis* at the Consualia and at the Robigalia are, respectively, a mistake by Tertullian and an invention by Ovid, if the coincidence of the Quirinalia and of the last act of the Fornacalia is accidental and without meaning, then by what miracle did these three accidents have as their convergent result the concern of Quirinus with the same thing, namely, with grain, at three important moments in its life as a food-stuff: first, when rust threatens it; then when it is stored in the granaries; and finally when the Romans, organized in the *curiae*, prolong its preservation by roasting it? If we do not have any preconceived ideas, two lessons emerge from this convergence: it must be part of the definition of Quirinus, in contrast with Jupiter and Mars, that he collaborates closely with other divinities, to the extent of lending them his flamen; and this collaboration concerns grain, insofar as it is harvested and processed by the Romans, to their advantage.¹⁸

As for the social sector in which the god is interested, the evidence of the Quirinalia confirms what is suggested by the most likely etymology of his name.¹⁹ Since the time of Kretschmer, Quirinus has generally been recognized as a derivative in *-no-* (of the type *dominus*, from *domo-*), formed on an ancient **co-uirio-*, which would have designated the community of the *uiri*, or might even have been the proper name of their habitat ("*Quirium*"). We must probably simplify this etymology by abandoning the imaginary neuter **couirio-* and the equally imaginary hill called **Quirium*, and being satisfied with the feminine **couiria-*, which survives in the form *cūria*, designating the smallest division of each of the primitive tribes.²⁰ Quirinus may be, not the god of each *cūria* and of its *curiales*, but the god of the whole

18. The interpretation of G. Rohde, *Die Kultsatzungen der römischen Pontifices*, RGV 25 (1936): 121-24, is vitiated by the theory which makes Quirinus a god "adopted" when synoecism took place.

19. Among the other ancient explanations of the name of Quirinus, the association with the city of Cures is no longer defended. The etymology based on a Sabine *curis*, *quiris* "spear" (the authenticity of which is guaranteed by a related Celtic word) is rather unlikely: (1) Sabine *qu* causes difficulty; (2) the spear belongs to Mars rather than to Quirinus; (3) the *Quirites*, as opposed to the *milites*, can scarcely have been defined by the spear or by any other weapon; (4) on the basis of the "spear," how are we to explain *curia*?

20. R. Adrados, *El sistema gentilicio decimal de los Indo-europeos occidentales y las orígenes de Roma* (1948), pp. 35-59, thinks that the *curia* was not originally a division of the tribes, but a direct (military) "mustering"; for him, in primitive times, *curia* = *decuria*.

curiate organization, of the people as a whole, regarded not as an indistinct *moles*, but in its fundamental divisions. Another word, inseparable from these, has had a great career: *Quirites*, from **co-uirites*, the specific name of the Romans viewed from the standpoint of their civil and political organization. It is certainly not an accident if one of the feminine abstractions which pontifical science gave to Quirinus as an associate was the plural *Virites* (cf. *uiritim*), which might be translated as "the individualities": in other words, the materials of the synthesis (*co-uirites*) over which the masculine Quirinus presides.

Thus, below the celestial, royal, and highly sacred Jupiter, and below the warlike Mars, the older god Quirinus seems to have been the patron of the Roman people, and, whether by himself or by the action of his flamen in the service of specialized divinities, to have watched particularly over the Romans' supply of grain.

The conceptual religious structure which is manifested in these three hierarchized terms is now familiar to Indo-Europeanists. It can be observed, with the special peculiarities of each of the societies, among the Indians and Iranians as well as among the ancient Scandinavians and, with more pronounced alterations, among the Celts. To judge from some survivals which are to be found despite the early reorganization of the traditions, it was also known to several waves of Greek invaders, the Achaeans and the Ionians. I have proposed, for the sake of brevity, to call this structure "the ideology of the three functions." The principal elements and the machinery of the world and of society are here divided into three harmoniously adjusted domains. These are, in descending order of dignity, sovereignty with its magical and juridical aspects and a kind of maximal expression of the sacred; physical power and bravery, the most obvious manifestation of which is victory in war; fertility and prosperity with all kinds of conditions and consequences, which are almost always meticulously analyzed and represented by a great number of related but different divinities, among whom now one, now the other, typifies the whole in formulary enumerations of gods. The "Jupiter-Mars-Quirinus" grouping, with the nuances appropriate to Rome, corresponds to the lists which occur in Scandinavia and in Vedic and pre-Vedic India: Óðinn, þórr, Freyr; Mitra-Varuṇa, Indra, Nāsatya.

For about thirty years, numerous studies of the whole and of details have been published on this subject by me or by scholars better qualified than I to explore the material in various areas: in the German collection for which this *Roman Religion* was originally written, the books which G. Widengren, J. de Vries, and W. Betz devote to the Iranian, Celtic, and Germanic religions are or will be based on the examination of this structure. For Vedic India,²¹ I can only refer the reader to the most recent scrutiny of the subject, "Les trois fonctions dans le *Rg Veda* et les dieux indiens de Mitani," published in the *Bulletin de l'Académie royale de Belgique, Classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques* 47 (1961): 265-98, and to the basic works by Stig Wikander. A provisional critical analysis of what had been proposed up to 1956 has been published under the title *L'idéologie tripartite des Indo-Européens*, Collection Latomus, vol. 24 (1956).²² The study continues to make progress, to undergo completion and correction, and the constantly renewed discussions which must be carried on contribute to this improvement. In a parallel development, a slower investigation is attempting to determine which societies throughout the world, outside of the Indo-Europeans, have succeeded in formulating and placing at the center of their thought these three needs which are in fact basic everywhere, but which the majority of human groups have been content merely to satisfy, without theorizing about them: sacred power and knowledge, attack and defense, and the nourishment and well-being of all.

In all the ancient Indo-European societies in which this ideological framework exists, it is a problem to know whether, and up to what point, the structure of the three functions is also expressed in the actual structure of society. For there is a difference between making an explicit survey of these three needs and causing a division of social behavior to correspond to them in practice, as men being then more or less exhaustively divided into functional "classes," into *Stände*—*Lehrstand*, *Wehrstand*, *Nährstand*, as it has sometimes been expressed in a phrase which is assonant but inadequate, especially in

21. This is not the place to criticize the volume written by J. Gonda for the same collection, *Die Religionen Indiens*, vol. 1: *Veda und älterer Hinduismus* (1960), in which the author speaks several times of my work. I have also examined his method of discussion several times and I shall probably return to it elsewhere.

22. Cf. also *Les dieux des Germains, essai sur la formation de la religion scandinave* (1959).

its first term. It seems certain, in all areas, that the rapid successes of the columns of Indo-European conquerors were due to the existence of specialists in war, notably in chariotry, such as the Indo-Iranian *márya*, of whom the Egyptian and Babylonian chronicles have preserved the terrified memory. The astonishing resemblances which have been pointed out between the druids and the brahmans and between the Irish *rí* and the Vedic *rājan* seem likewise to indicate that in at least one part of the Indo-European world the ancient types of the administrator of sacred matters and the trustee of politico-religious power survived long migrations. Thus the two higher functions must have been guaranteed by the differentiated groups of the general population, which was often enlarged by the addition of conquered natives, and on which the third function devolved. But it is also certain that at the end of these great travels, after they had settled down, the greater part of the Indo-European-speaking groups sooner or later, often very soon, abandoned this framework in actual practice. It thus remained only ideological and formed a means of analyzing and understanding the world, but with regard to social organization it offered at best only an ideal cherished by the philosophers and a legendary view of the beginnings. The light of history overtakes Greece at the moment when this change was accomplished almost everywhere, at the point where the functional meaning of the Ionian tribes was no more than a mythical fact. Among the Indo-Iranians themselves, India is the only region in which this archaic division was hardened, through an inverse evolution, in its system of the three arya *varṇa*—*brāhmaṇa*, *kṣatriya*, *vaiśya*—which dominate the non-arya fourth, the *śūdra*. If the Avesta and the Mazdean books which depend on it speak at length about the three estates (or about the four, the fourth being, as in Ionia, that of the artisans), we nevertheless know that human society was not actually divided in this way, at least not in an exhaustive or stable way, either in the Achaemenid empire or in the other Iranian societies of the Near East.

The problem must thus arise at Rome as well. But it arises under almost desperate conditions, since too many centuries elapsed between the origins and the account which the annalists gave of them for us to be able to expect authentic information concerning the earliest social organization. If in the eighth century there was any

survival of a division of society into three classes, respectively operating the three functions, its last traces quickly disappeared, at any rate before the end of the regal period. It was probably one of the accomplishments of the Etruscan domination to achieve its destruction. In my "Preliminary Remarks,"²³ I insist upon the fact that the legend about the war between the Latins of Romulus and the Sabines of Titus Tatius and their subsequent fusion was consistent in its development and in the significance of its episodes with the type of story that, in other Indo-European areas, forms the basis of legends concerning the formation of the complete divine society, starting with the original separation and hostility of its future components. This kind of story occurs among the Scandinavians (war, then fusion of the Æsir and Vanir) and among the Indians (conflict, then close association of the higher gods and the Nāsatya): on the one hand are the gods representing the first and second functions, magical power and warlike power, on the other hand the gods of fertility, health, riches, etc.; similarly Romulus, the son of a god and the beneficiary of Jupiter's promises, sometimes joined by his Etruscan ally Lucumon, the expert in war, is originally opposed to Titus Tatius, the leader of the wealthy Sabines and the father of the Sabine women, and then forms with him a complete and viable society. Now, this legend, in which each of the three leaders, with his respective following, is thoroughly characterized in terms of one of the functions—reread in particular lines 9–32 of the first *Roman Elegy* of Propertius—is intended to justify the oldest known division, the three tribes of which these leaders are the eponyms, the companions of Romulus becoming the *Ramnes*, those of Lucumon the *Luceres*, and those of Titus Tatius the *Titienses*. May we assume from this that the three primitive tribes (whose names, be it said in passing, have an Etruscan ring, and thus were either changed or at least retouched under the last kings) had in effect a functional definition, with the *Ramnes* controlling political government and the cult (like the companions of "Remus" in Propertius 4.1.9–26), the *Luceres* being specialists in war (like Lucumon in the same text of Propertius, 26–29), and the *Titienses* being defined by their wealth of sheep (like the Tatius of Propertius, 30)? The question remains open. I have offered a number of reasons for an affirmative answer, but none is

23. Above, pp. 60–78.

compelling.²⁴ In the fourth and third centuries the fabricators of Roman history had only a very vague idea of the pre-Servian tribes, and it is possible that the Ramnes, the Luceres, and the Titienses had received their functional coloration only from the "legend of the origins," which was inherited from the Indo-European tradition and, as such, was faithfully trifunctional. But for the present study, an analysis of tenacious ideas and not a pursuit of inaccessible facts, this uncertainty is not very serious. It is more important for us to recognize the implicit philosophy, the theory of the world and of society which supports the legends of the origins, than to try to isolate from it the part which belongs to history.

The interpretation of the divine triad allows a better understanding of the reasons which account for its being invoked in several of the formulas and rituals cited above.²⁵ Generally speaking, wherever the three gods appear together, society as a whole and as a structure is concerned, using simultaneously for its advantage all the great principles of divine and human action.

Fides, Good Faith, is the patroness of all relations between persons and groups of persons; without her nothing is possible, on any level; on her depend the reciprocal concord and trust of the Romans, the harmonious adjustment of the rights and duties of all, regardless of where they were born or brought up, not to mention the stable peace or the just war with the foreigner, or the equitable arrangements between men and gods. One may thus conceive that the three major flamens take part in her cult, and that all three, crossing the city in the same vehicle and sacrificing together, demonstrate the total agreement of the powers they represent.

The danger from which the *deutio* must deliver the army, the *populus Romanus Quiritium*, as the formula puts it, is no less total. It is thus natural that the suppliant, before his collective and indistinct references to *Diui Nouensiles*, *dii Indigetes*, and then to *Diui quorum est potestas nostrorum hostiumque*, should address himself, between the god of beginnings and the specialists of the battle and of the piece

24. This is the matter of chap. 2 of *NR*, pp. 86-127 ("Properce et les tribus," study of the variants with two and three races), and of the second part of *JMQ* 4 (1948): 113-71: "Les trois tribus primitives de Rome," summed up in *Idéol.*, pp. 12-15. See now *ME* 1: 15-16, 290-302, 428-36, and *IR*, pt. II, chap. 5 ("Les trois tribus primitives").

25. Above, pp. 141-47.

of ground where it takes place, to the divine triad which has power over the three constituent elements of social life.

The *ancile*, the bilobate buckler which fell from the sky, and the eleven indistinguishable copies which were made from it and which share in its sacredness, are one of the principal groups of talismans at Rome. Their number doubtless alludes to the full annual cycle considered in terms of its divisions, but, throughout this cycle, their power protects another totality, that of the Roman people. When we study Mars and Quirinus more fully and differentially, we shall try to understand the meaning of the juxtaposition of their two groups of Salii in the rites of spring and autumn. But for now we can mention that several other Indo-European peoples possessed talismans which had fallen from the sky: for example, the golden objects which the Scythians honored every year (Herod. 4.5); or the three stones honored at Orchomenos under the name of Charites (Paus. 9.38.1). These talismans refer explicitly to the three functions: in the case of the Charites this is apparent from the invocation of the fourteenth Olympic (3-7), which is well interpreted by the scholiast (wisdom, beauty, valor);²⁶ as for the Scythian talismans, it appears in their very enumeration (cultic cup, warrior's axe, and the plow with its yoke).²⁷ In the case of the Salii, the *tutela Jouis Martis Quirini* expresses in a different way the same trifunctional and thus total meaning of the talismans which are in their charge.²⁸

We can also usefully take up here the old theory of the *spolia opima*, the only item of ritual evidence which Latte has spared. This theory is known in two variants. One, defining *opima* as only those

26. See F. Vian, "La triade des rois d'Orchomène," *Coll. Lat. 45 (Hommages à G. Dumézil)* (1960): 216-24, esp. pp. 218-19.

27. "La préhistoire indo-iranienne des castes," *JA* 216 (1930): 109-30; "Les trois trésors des ancêtres dans l'épopée Narte," *RHR* 157 (1960): 141-54; "La société scythique avait-elle des classes fonctionnelles?" *IJJ* 5 (1962): 187-202; *ME* 1: 446-52, 485-503. My interpretation (1930) of the Scythian objects which fell from the sky would improve that of A. Christensen, and has itself been improved (with respect to the connection of the yoke and the plow on the analogy of an Avestan expression) by E. Benveniste, "Traditions indo-iraniennes sur les classes sociales," *JA* 230 (1939): 532-33.

28. For other groups of mythical talismans with trifunctional meaning—which did not fall from the sky—see *Ideol.* p. 25 (§19), with the corresponding references, 97-98: the jewels of the Irish Tuatha dé Danann; the objects fabricated for the gods by the Vedic Rbhu and by the Eddic Black Elves. In contrast with the Scythian, Irish, and Vedic objects, if not the Charites-stones of Orchomenos, the *ancilia* are uniform: on this subject see L. Gerschel, "Sur un schème trifonctionnel dans une famille de légendes germaniques," *RHR* 150 (1956): 55-92, esp. 56-59, 68-69.

spolia quae dux populi Romani duci hostium detraxit, says that they are offered uniformly to Jupiter Feretrius, and confines itself to noting the rarity of such an exploit. In fact, only three leaders are supposed to have succeeded in accomplishing it: Romulus himself, the conqueror of Acron king of Caenina, and the reputed founder of the cult; Cossus, the conqueror of Tolumnius, the king of Veii (428); and lastly Marcellus, the conqueror of Viridomarus, the chief of Insubres (222). The other variant is more highly nuanced. It can be read in the greatest detail in Festus (p. 302 L²), who bases his account on the Books of the Pontiffs as reported by Varro, and who also cites, from the same source, a "law of Numa Pompilius"; the text contains some corrupted words and some lacunae which can be reconstructed or filled out with assurance, but it also presents a certain basic confusion from which one can escape only by interpretation, by assuming a more coherent doctrine. The *spolia opima* exist every time the conquered party is the *dux hostium*, even if the conqueror is not the Roman *dux* in person. As in the preceding variant, there are three kinds; this number, however, is no longer the result of accidental historical circumstances but forms part of the definition: the first *spolia* must be offered to Jupiter Feretrius, the second to Mars, and the third to "Janus Quirinus." On the occasion of the first, an ox is sacrificed in the name of the state; for the second, the *solitaurilia* (which probably means the *suouetaurilia*, a boar, a ram, and a bull); for the third, a lamb. Moreover, the man who has won these spoils at the expense of the enemy leader receives in the first case three hundred pieces of money, probably two hundred in the second, and in the third only one hundred.²⁹

In this variant as in the other, the adjectives *prima*, *secunda*, *tertia* have generally been understood in terms of time,³⁰ and Servius (*Aen.* 6.859) does not hesitate to write, confusing the two variants, that Romulus (in conformity with the law of his successor, Numa!) offered the *prima spolia opima* to Jupiter Feretrius, Cossus the *secunda* to Mars, and Marcellus the *tertia* to Quirinus. To be sure, this interpretation is not impossible, since we are dealing with legend, and legend will support anything, but it is strange. It attributes to Numa not merely a prescription but a prophecy announcing that in all

29. On the meaning of this *lex regia*, see G. C. Picard, cited below, p. 237, n. 49 (end.)

30. Which I myself have done up to now.

Roman history there would be only three occasions for celebrating the ritual and indicating the successive varieties of this ritual. Consequently Latte (pp. 204-5), by completing and harmonizing the text of Festus, prefers another, more satisfactory interpretation; but he sees in it, for what reason I do not know, a mark of "the influence of the pontiffs on the systematization of Roman religion"; after all, casuistry is as old as the world. "Thus," he says, "the consecration to Jupiter of the arms of an enemy leader was bound to the condition that the Roman who had killed him should exercise a command, with his own auspices. In the same sense, there were *secunda* or *tertia spolia*, according to whether the exploit had been accomplished by the commander of a Roman force without independent auspices, or by a common soldier. In these last two cases they had to be consecrated not to Jupiter Feretrius, but to Mars and to Janus Quirinus." Thus, *prima*, *secunda*, and *tertia* are here understood as indications not of time, but of value or degree. If this interpretation is correct, the distribution of the three kinds of *spolia opima* among the gods is remarkably consistent with the trifunctional explanation of the triad. Jupiter receives the *spolia* from the hand of the *rex*, or of the republican leader substituted for the *rex*, to whom he has given signs during the taking of the auspices; Mars receives the *spolia* acquired by the officer functioning strictly as a military technician, without the personal auspices which would have given him religious meaning,³¹ as in the first case; finally, Quirinus receives the *spolia* conquered by a mass soldier, who is in no way distinguished from the organized mass implied in the name **Co-uirinus*.³² Do we not find here the trifunctional distinction of the three gods, but aligned with the circumstance, which is warlike and which obliges the three gods to characterize their "men" by their relation to a single warlike act, leaving for the last, Quirinus, only a feeble, but still authentic part of his definition?

We have been reminded recently, in passing, that among other Indo-European peoples, the "third function" was parceled out among a whole troop of divine patrons, in contrast to the small number of patrons of sovereignty and the single patron of warlike power.

31. The discussions of the ancients about the exact title and command of Cossus are not important here.

32. Compare the use of the singular *Quiris* in the meaning of "any Roman of the lower class": Juv. 8.47 (*ima plebe Quiritem*), Ov. Am. 1.7.29 (*minimum de plebe Quiritem*), 3.14.9 (*ignoto meretrix corpus iunctura Quiriti*).

The explanation is easy: save perhaps in our societies of the atomic era, commanding, praying, and fighting are relatively simple modes of conduct as compared with the innumerable particular patterns of behavior which are demanded by the exploitation of different soils, the raising of various kinds of animals, and the administration of increasingly differentiated riches, as well as the supervision of health and fertility, and the enjoyment of the pleasures of the senses. Vedic India, for example, groups on this level, near the *Aśvin*, who exert a multiform benevolence, goddesses like *Sarasvatī*, the personification of the river; the Waters; the goddesses specializing in generation; *Pūṣan*, the master of herds; *Draviṇodā*, the giver of riches; and many others.

As we have seen, a similar situation has been revealed at Rome by the remarkable schedule of activities of the *flamen Quirinalis*. While the *Dialis*, and probably the *Martialis*, are strictly bound to the cult of their respective gods, the *Quirinalis* officiates in the service of the agricultural *Consus* as the masculine counterpart of *Ops*, performs a propitiatory sacrifice to *Robigus*, the god of wheat rust, and probably takes part in the *parentatio* of the mysterious *Larentia*, the fabulously wealthy and generous benefactress of the Roman people.

This diversity, which caused Wissowa to believe that the priest of *Quirinus* had been dispossessed of his old, properly *Quirinal* functions, and subsequently reemployed in various new duties, is on the contrary consistent with the nature of the god, if one understands it as we have done. But the legend of the origins of Rome provides a striking statement and development of this theologem.

When *Romulus* and *Titus Tatius*—personages who incarnate and illustrate the first and third functions in this epic scene³³—bring their war to an end and found the complete Roman society, each of them fulfills his religious duty and institutes cults in accordance with his respective function. Thus while *Romulus* institutes only one, that of *Jupiter*, *Titus Tatius* is said to introduce to Rome a whole series of cults, which *Varro* lists (*L.L.* 5.74): *uouit Opi, Florae, Vediovi Saturnoque, Soli, Lunae, Volcano et Summano, itemque Larundae, Termino, Quirino, Vortumno, Laribus, Dianae Lucinaeque*.³⁴ To be sure, this list

33. Above, pp. 66–73.

34. *Varro* here does not yield to his "Sabinism": he claims to get his information from the "annals": *nam ut annales dicunt, uouit Opi*, etc. Several names in this list occur in *Dion.* 2.50.3, but the author gives up the attempt to render the others in Greek; *Aug. Ciu. D.*

is a composite one and in part anachronistic, containing such divinities as Diana, Sol, and Luna who do not belong to the oldest Roman stock; and like the Jupiter Stator attributed to Romulus, it bears the mark of the century in which the first annalists worked. Nevertheless, with respect to the meaning and the level of the gods, it is remarkably homogeneous and consistent with the "Sabine component," as it was understood by these annalists. Of the fourteen divinities who thus accompanied Quirinus, seven are concerned in diverse ways with agriculture and the rustic life (Ops—the associate in the calendar of the god of the Consualia; Flora, Saturnus, Terminus, Vortumnus; Volcanus, to whom a sacrifice was made on 23 August, at the same time as to Ops and Quirinus, very probably as a precaution against the burning of the crops; and the Lares, the patrons of soil allotments and of crossroads); two favor births (Diana and Lucina); two (Sol and Luna) are stars which Roman religion retains only in their roles as regulators of the seasons and the months; and one, or perhaps two (Vedius and Larunda—probably a variant of the name of the beneficiary of the Larentalia) have or were accepted as having a connection with the underworld. In short—and the almost unknown Summanus does not contradict this—these gods share among themselves the portions, the dependencies, and the appendages of the domain of prosperity and fertility, and Quirinus is only one member of this great family.

One result of the parceling out of the third function, at Rome and elsewhere, is that none of the gods who patronize it partially can represent it completely in the schematic lists which sum up the tripartite structure. Even the god whom dominant usage installs in this rank in the "canonical list" is not and cannot be a perfect representative. The reason for choosing him in preference over others is

4.23.1, gives the same shortened list, but instead of attributing to Romulus only a single foundation (Jupiter), he has him establish, symmetrically with Tatius, an entire list of cults (*Janum Jouem Martem*, etc., and even *Herculem*! through a displacement of what appears in Liv. 1.7.15). The Christian doctor thus spoils the clear opposition between unity (on the first level) and multiplicity, apportionment (on the third); cf. a Germanic fact with the same significance, in *La saga de Hadingus* (1953), pp. 109–10. During the course of this book I shall often use the expression "the gods of Titus Tatius" as a brief designation of this grouping of gods. I trust that my critics will do me the favor of believing that I do not attribute their foundation to someone named Titus Tatius, or to anyone else; in my eyes, the expression has only a theological meaning, not a historical one.

often clear. Among the Vedic Indians, for example, the listing Mitra-Varuṇa, Indra, and Nāsātya, which I have mentioned above, has been confirmed among the para-Indians of the Euphrates by the discovery of a Mitannian-Hittite treatise dating from the fourteenth century B.C. In the third term, the twin Nāsātya, or Aśvin, are saviors in every respect, famed for their powers of healing, like the Greek Dioscuri; moreover a specific fact suggests that originally one of them patronized the raising of horses and the other the raising of cattle, that is, the two kinds of animals of interest to the archaic Indo-Iranian societies;³⁵ finally their character as twins places them in a symbolic relationship with fertility in general. This does not prevent them from yielding their authority over the third function, in other versions of the list, to the aquatic goddesses, in others to Pūṣan, a more precise specialist than themselves in cattle-breeding, and in still others to the collective notion of “*Viśve Devāḥ*,” which then probably takes on the meaning of “organized mass of the gods,” the gods regarded as a unit, in their triple division, without regard to their singularities.³⁶ This last divine specification recalls the earthly *vaśīya*, the third of the social classes: these are the members of the *viśaḥ*, the “clans,” which are thus defined by their social frameworks, while the first two classes receive names (*brāhmaṇa*, *kṣatriya*) derived from those of their principles (*brāhman*, sacred principle, whatever its precise meaning may be; *kṣatrá* “power”).

At Rome it is precisely this notion of an organized mass,³⁷ exemplified in the name *Quirinus*, which was retained in the canonical list, but Quirinus by himself represents in so small a way the whole of the “third function” that he seems to have been set in this place of honor solely to put his flamen at the disposition of more material aspects on the same level: the care of grain, and the underworld. Even his feast is ambiguous, associating a treatment of grain with a view of the people distributed in *curiae*, under the control of the *Curio maximus*.

35. S. Wikander, “Pāṇḍavasagan och Mahābhāratas mytiska förutsättningar,” *Religion och Bibel* 6 (1947): 27–39, translation and commentary in my *JMQ* 4: 37–85 (pp. 48–50 on the twins; cf. p. 59); “Nakula et Sahadeva,” *Orientalia Suecana* 6 (1957): 65–95 (pp. 79–84 on the differentiations of the twins with regard to horses and cattle); see now *ME* 1: 73–89.

36. *JMQ* 4: 156–61.

37. Perhaps this may explain an indication by Plin. *N.H.* 15. 120–21: two myrtles once stood in front of the temple of Quirinus; one was called the patrician myrtle, the other the plebeian myrtle; the former died, and the other grew and flourished along with the progress of the plebs.

From this we may imagine that in particular circumstances the canonical Jupiter-Mars-Quirinus list had been felt to be inadequate, or even improper, and that the third term had been replaced by another divinity of the third function, one of what we might call "the gods of Titus Tatius," to use once more the terms of the legend. One of these circumstances, which again involves the *rex*, must be mentioned.³⁸

In the republican era, the Regia of the Forum, the "house of the king," is the center of religious affairs. It is within its walls that the deliberations of the pontiffs take place and that the great pontiff himself resides. If it is not properly a temple, it at least contains sacred objects and serves as a setting for cultic ceremonies. The objects and the ceremonies, both evidently archaic, have been preserved, like the *rex* himself, and sheltered from further ideological developments. Though it was burned and rebuilt several times, excavations have revealed the very simple plan which corresponds closely to what we know of its usages from other sources. And it is likely that the *reges* had a Regia of this kind before they descended into the valley, at the very time when their domain was confined to the Palatine.³⁹ In the Forum's Regia, of reduced dimensions, the principal structure is trapezoid, almost rectangular, and is divided into three consecutive sections, one greater than the other two, which are roughly equal in size. Beyond the pontiffs' administration, the religious activities indicated there are of three quite different types, concerning two of which the texts say expressly that they take place in two particular *sacraria*, two chapels. It is natural to identify these chapels with the two smaller sections, and to attribute the principal section, the accessory buildings, and the court to the other uses.

1. Certain acts are guaranteed by the sacred personages of the highest rank, the *rex*, the *regina*, and the *flaminica Dialis*: on all *nundinae* the *flaminica* sacrifices a ram to Jupiter (Macr. 1.16.30); on 9 January, at the Agonalia, the first feast of the year, the *rex*

38. I sum up here "Les cultes de la Regia, les trois fonctions et la triade Jupiter Mars Quirinus," *Lat.* 13 (1954): 129-39. See Lugli, RA, pp. 212-15 (*Regia pontificis*).

39. For the problem treated here, the age of the Regia whose ruins still survive is unimportant, Frank Brown, "The Regia," *MAAR* 12 (1935): 67-88, and plates IV-VIII. Recent excavations have brought to light constructions from the seventh and sixth centuries, F. Brown, "New Soundings in the Regia: The Evidence for the Early Republic," in *Les origines de la République romaine, Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique de la Fondation Hardt* 13 (1957): 47-64, and three plans.

offers a ram to Janus, the god of "January" and of all beginnings (Ov. *F.* 1.318; Varr. *L.L.* 3.12); on all calends the *regina sacrorum* immolates either a sow or a ewe to Juno. If Janus and Juno, whom the royal couple serve, are here considered regulators of time in the most general sense (the beginning of each year, the beginning of each month), the Jupiter of the *nundinae*, who is served by the *flaminica Dialis*, seems to have a political meaning. In fact the legend attributes the institution of this monthly occasion to Servius Tullius, "so that the people might come in a crowd from the country to the city, to arrange the affairs of the city and the country" (Cassius, in Macr. 1.16.33); "so that people might come in from the country to Rome to do their marketing and to receive the laws; so that the acts of the leaders and of the Senate might be proclaimed to a more numerous audience and, after having been proposed on three consecutive *nundinae*, that they might be readily known to one and all" (Rutilius, *ibid.* 34).⁴⁰ To sum up, all these cults resorted to the first function, to the administration of the life of the world as well as that of the state.

2. A *sacrarium Martis*, in the Regia, shelters the warlike talismans of Rome examined at length in my "Preliminary Remarks."⁴¹ Here are kept the *hastae Martis* whose shaking is a menacing omen; here, when war is declared, the designated general comes first to make the shields move (*commouebat*), and then the "spear of the statue," while saying: *Mars uigila!* (Serv. *Aen.* 8.3; 7.603). It is probably also in this *sacrarium* that the sacrifice mentioned by Cincius (in Fest. p. 419 L²) takes place, which was offered in the Regia by the *Saliae uirgines*, dressed in the costume of the *Salii*, *cum apicibus paludatae*.

3. Finally a second *sacrarium*, to which another discussion has introduced us,⁴² belongs to Ops Consiva, the Abundance who is related to Consus. It is known from an indication by Varro (*L.L.* 6.21) and from a mention by Festus (p. 354 L²). The former says that this chapel was so holy (*adeo sanctum*, a likely correction for the unintelligible *ita actum*) that only the Vestal virgins and the *sacerdos publicus*, that is, the grand pontiff, could enter it; the latter speaks of a vessel of a

40. See A. K. Michels, *The Calendar of the Roman Republic* (1967), pp. 84-89 ("Nundinal letters and *Nundinae*") and 191-206 (app. 3: "*Nundinae* and the *trinum nundinum*").

41. Above, pp. 23-26.

42. Above, pp. 156-58.

particular type (*praefericulum*), *quo ad sacrificia utebantur in sacrario Opis Consuiae*.

Thus the "house of the king" joins, or rather juxtaposes in three places, the cults which clearly involve sacred sovereignty, war, and abundance. What is more natural than that the king of the whole society, despite his special affinity for the first function, should be active in the other two? But the principal interest of the grouping lies in the fact that Ops, another divinity of the "group of Titus Tatius," should be given the representative role which the canonical list, that of the major flamens, assigns to Quirinus. It is not under the aspect of the people as consumers, but directly under that of the food to be consumed, that the Regia harbors the third function.⁴³

This first examination of the triad, as we have seen, has not been fruitless. Voluntarily confined to what the personal statute or the activities of the three *flamines maiores* tell us, and to certain allied facts, it surely does not exhaust all of Jupiter, all of Mars, or all of Quirinus in the era of the monarchy, but it provides a solid and specific balance sheet, and certain fixed and coordinate points, starting from which, little by little, the complete dossiers of the three gods can be explored. It is to this extension of the investigation that we shall first proceed, with the double intention of enriching the original picture which we have formed of each god and of following him throughout his history.

But we must recall a rule of procedure which is often forgotten, at the risk of great confusion. In describing a divinity, the definition of his mode of action is more characteristic than the list of places where he is active or of the occasions for his services. An important divinity is inevitably solicited by everybody and for everything, sometimes in unexpected places, far removed from his principal province. Nevertheless he acts there, and if we confine ourselves to registering these unusual locations of this activity, we are in danger of joining it with-

43. Information in Gell. 4.6, corroborates this interpretation. According to *antiquae memoriae*, one day when the *hastae Martis* had shaken in the Regia, a *senatus consultum* ordered one of the consuls to sacrifice to Jupiter and to Mars *hostiis maioribus*, and to appease those of the other gods who he thought should be appeased, specifying, however, that if *succidanae* victims are requested (to replace the victims which would not have been accepted by the experts: *si primis hostiis litatum non erat*), the consul would also sacrifice to Robigus. It will be recalled that the Robigalia are one of the occasions at which the *flamen Quirinalis* officiates; see above, p. 158.

out any appraisal of relative importances to the other, principal locations, and saying that the divinity cannot be given a limited description, that he is "omnivalent" or "indeterminate." On the contrary, if we do not concern ourselves with *where*, but with *how* he acts, we may almost always state that he preserves a constant behavior and constant methods, even in his most aberrant activities. The object of the study is to determine this behavior and these methods. A peasant will invoke a warlike god for the protection of his field: the god will remain no less warlike in this activity, and will not be "agrarian" in the ordinary sense of the word, in the sense in which Ceres is. A general will expect and solicit from a sovereign god the happy outcome of his war: the god, even in this circumstance, will still remain sovereign, and not warlike. Jupiter and Mars provide good illustrations of this rule.

3

JUPITER

The name *Juppiter*, at least the element *Jou-* (**Diou-*), is the common property of the Italic peoples; in more or less well-preserved forms, it recurs in the Oscan and Umbrian languages, as well as in Latin. Moreover, its formation is obvious, and no one contests its Indo-European origin. It corresponds to Vedic *Dyáuḥ* (Div-) and Greek *Ζεύς* (*Δι-*), and its proper meaning, preserved in Vedic where the word served simultaneously as divine name and appellative, is "heaven," with the etymology suggesting the nuance of "shining heaven."

At this point a fundamental mistake is frequently made. Once the antiquity and the obvious meaning of the name have been recognized, it is concluded that the primitive Jupiter was nothing more than what his name signifies, and that he is to be equated with the homonymous Vedic god, who is in fact nothing more than Heaven personified and who has as his sole function a universal fatherhood, expressed also in the phrase *Dyáuḥ pitā*. It is that and that alone which the ancestors of the Romans are supposed to have found in their heritage. This argument, which has seemed so evident to many authors that they have not even dreamed of formulating it, ignores two facts. One is familiar to whoever studies the pantheons of the so-called semi-civilized peoples, that there is no limitative interdependence between the name and the definition of a god, between the etymology and the content of a divine concept; the other is familiar to whoever compares the religions of related peoples, that gods with different names may occupy homologous positions within parallel structures and, inversely, that gods with the same name may have undergone change, may have slipped into different positions. Not one Scandinavian god bears a name that can be found in the Vedic mythology, and yet the

interrelations of Óðinn, þórr, and Freyr (or Njörðr and Freyr), often listed in that order, are reminiscent of those of Varuṇa, Indra, and the Nāsatya in the oldest trifunctional lists known to the Indians. Inversely, in the Zoroastrian reform, Miθra received the attributes and the functions of Indra after the latter had been excommunicated and cast down among the demons. The homonymy of Jupiter and *Dyauh pitā* admits of no conclusion as to their homology. It admits of such a conclusion even less as the Zeus of the Greeks presents a complexity suggesting that of Jupiter and placing him at an equal distance from the simplicity, the insignificance of Dyauh. All that the etymology of the name can suggest is that in the beginnings—not in the Roman or the Greek beginnings, but in Indo-European prehistory—**Dyeu-*, in conformity with his name, was no more important than the later Vedic Dyauh. But at certain points in the Indo-European domain, and in the later stages which developed between Indo-European unity and the installation of the Italic peoples and the Hellenes in their respective territories, the processes of evolution had been able to promote this god, entangled as it were in his immense and passive naturalistic function, to the active position which, from the earliest testimonies, characterizes Jupiter no less than Zeus.¹ Zeus and Jupiter remain sky gods, but they are also sovereign gods on the one hand and lightning gods on the other. By any of these specifications their Vedic homologue is not their homonym; in the *R̥g Veda*, the sovereign gods are Varuṇa and Miθra, and the lightning god is Indra.

Even as sky god, Jupiter is not the same as Dyauh. As long as they did not go to school to the Greeks, the Romans do not seem to have troubled themselves about the more remote perspectives of the universe and the marvels which people them; even the sun and the moon have scarcely any role in their religion, while the stars have none at all, nor the firmament. The celestial vault, that which lies behind the blue alternating with black, has no more interest for the Latin city than that which lies beyond the great sea. Dyauh comprises all that: the Vedic cosmography distinguishes the earth below, *pr̥thivī*, with its substratum; the distant sky above, *dyáuḥ*, with, sometimes,

1. **dyeu* has had another promotion in Hittite; there it replaces **deiw-* as an appellative for "god." These finally converging evolutions—Miθra, Zeus, Jupiter, both celestial and thundering—happened independently, each as a result of specific causes. The influence of some polyvalent gods of the Near East is not excluded as far as Greece is concerned, but seems very improbable for the Italian Jupiters.

a beyond; and in between, an intermediate space, *antārikṣam*, roughly the atmosphere. This remoteness of Dyauh dominates his theology, which is inactive if not passive. The Greek Zeus—grandson and successor of a Heaven, Ouranos, who is more comparable to the Vedic Heaven—remains fully celestial, annexes the atmosphere, and acts primarily in the atmosphere: the peak of his Olympus is in the “intermediate space.” The Roman Jupiter himself has come down nearer to earth. Despite the location of all his principal sanctuaries on the modest heights of the City, he remains, like them, close to the plain. One result of this evolution in both Greece and Rome, apparently dating from prehistoric times, was to hand over to Zeus as well as to Jupiter the control of that accessory which is more atmospheric than celestial, the thunderbolt. In fact, in his naturalistic aspect, Jupiter is, rather than of the serene light of day or of heat, the master of the thunderbolt, of the lightning with its ornamental effects and its accompanying storm and rain. Even an epithet like *Lucetius*, known also in Oscan territory, which seems at first to refer directly to light, and which the Hellenized Romans understood in this sense (Serv. *Aen.* 9.570; etc.), actually designates the flash of lightning or of the thunderbolt: the venerable song of the *Salii* makes use in the vocative of the variant *Leucesie*, in a context having to do with thunder. And Jupiter did not need the example of Zeus or the meticulous casuistry of the *Libri fulgurales* of the Etruscans to communicate with mankind by this sign, whereby the *flaminica Dialis* made known a great religious sensibility. If another ancient epithet, *Elicius*, does not allude to the thunderbolt, as certain Roman scholars believed (and as is the case in the legend of the origins, when King Tullus Hostilius is blasted with lightning by an improperly invoked Jupiter Elicius), doubtless it refers, as many moderns think, to the opening of the reservoirs of rain.² Although it is not certain that Jupiter was the object of the somewhat magical ritual of the *lapis manalis*, the stone brought in through the Porta Capena and carried through the city in times of drought (Fest. p. 255 L², etc.; Latte, p. 78, n. 4), he was so well understood to be the master of the rain that relatively late ceremonies, like the *Nudipedalia*, which were intended to bring rain, naturally became connected with him (Petr. 44, etc.)

2. Cf. the name of the ceremony of the *lapis manalis*: “*Aquaelictum*” (Paul. p. 94 L²); F. Bömer, “Der sog. *Lapis Manalis*,” *ARW* 33 (1936): 270–81.

Finally, as god of the neighboring sky, he causes to appear there the *auspicia*, the signs which as sovereign god he gives to the heads of Rome through the flight of birds and which the augurs—*interpretes Jouis* O. M., as Cicero calls them (*Leg.* 2.20)³—observe in a portion of the sky.

Already certain aspects of the theory of lightning flashes, even more that concerning the auspices, go beyond the naturalistic aspect of Jupiter and involve his sovereign aspect. *Rex*, colleague and celestial monitor of the earthly *rex*—it is to this title that he owes his position and his prestige. Naturally, it is to this title as well that he was most responsive during the slow development and the brutal movements which transformed Roman political life. Although the evidences of Jupiter's sovereignty multiply most notably after his promotion to the Capitol, it existed beyond doubt from the most ancient times. The principal facts have been pointed out in the sketch of the earliest Jupiter,⁴ especially the complementarity of his flamen and of the *rex*, and his patronage of the royal and political markets, the *nundinae*. We may add the obscure festival of the *Poplifugia*, concerning which nothing is known, but which seems to be a counterpart of the *Regifugium*, qualified as *feriae Jouis*, indicating an articulation *populus . . . rex* which can only be understood in political terms.

Politics and law, power and justice, are united, at least ideally, at many points. Another element of the prestige of Jupiter, as of Zeus and the sovereign gods of Vedic India, Varuna and Mitra, is his role as witness, as guarantor, as avenger of oaths and pacts, in private as well as in public life, in commerce between citizens or with foreigners. Classical poetry has made familiar the somewhat Grecized image of the god "sanctioning" a commitment by a thunderbolt. Some less spectacular archaic rituals are founded on this vocation of the god, notably the ritual of the *fetiales*, the priests who go to demand amends for a wrong from a potential enemy, who then declare war on him in a pious and just form, and who finally conclude peace with him. Jupiter Lapis, so named for the occasion, after the stone which the *fetial* hurls with an execratory formula,⁵ does not

3. Catalano, *DA*, p. 155.

4. Above, pp. 152, 172-73.

5. Above, pp. 92-93, and below, p. 590.

seem to be separable from the very ancient Jupiter Feretrius, whose tiny temple on the Capitol served as a conservatory for this stone.

Oaths are sworn in the name of Jupiter, but also in the name of *Dius Fidius*,⁶ and the connection between these two personages is a controverted question. Was *Dius Fidius* first a god on the sovereign level, a neighbor of Jupiter but independent of him, reserving to himself, as the *fides* included in his name indicates, the oath and the whole province of loyalty, and leaving to Jupiter politico-religious sovereignty, the *regnum*, the *auspicia*? Or, on the contrary, is *Dius Fidius* only one aspect, one special name of Jupiter which may have acquired a certain autonomy? If they are truly distinct, the two divinities have in any case interpenetrated each other, for Jupiter also watches over oaths, *Dius Fidius* also hurls the lightning, and both require an opening to the sky in the roofs of their temples. Neither the relations of *Dius Fidius* with another totally mysterious personage named *Semo Sancus*, who is invoked in oaths, nor the resemblance of his name to that of the Umbrian patron god of the citadel, in the Tables of Iguvium (dat. *Fisie Sansie*, etc.), orient this problem, which is, to tell the truth, of minor concern.⁷

The meaning of the sole proprietorship ascribed to Jupiter of the Ides of each month has also been discussed. In any case this connection is important: on the Ides, in a procession which went up the Via Sacra, the *flamen Dialis* led a white lamb with great solemnity to the Capitol and there sacrificed it; moreover, the *dies natalis* of the temples of Jupiter generally falls on one of the Ides. Certain Roman antiquaries explained this affinity by Jupiter's celestial and luminous character (Macr. 1.15.14): the Ides, theoretically marking the full moon, would be the brightest time of the month, since the brilliance of the sun is succeeded by that of the other heavenly body. This ingenious explanation, which has been at times accepted by the moderns, is not satisfactory, since Jupiter never manifests himself as a god of light per se and his supposed connection with the moon is equally unfounded. Personally I prefer to regard the problem in the context of the "singular days" of the month, taking account of the Calends, the day which is opposed to the Ides and which also has a

6. P. Boyancé, "Fides et le serment," *Coll. Lat.* 58 (*Hommages à A. Grenier*) (1962): 329-41.

7. Latte, pp. 126-28. A. Ernout, *Philologica* 2 (1957): 178, separates *Sancus* from *sancio*, etc., and suggests an Etruscan origin.

patron, Janus. The reason for the latter patronage is obvious: Janus is *deus omnium initiorum*, the god of the *prima*, and the Calends are the first day of the month. As for Jupiter's claim to the Ides, the peak of the month, the articulation of the waxing with the waning fortnight, is it not founded on the symmetrical reason that Jupiter, according to Varro's formula, possesses the *summa*?⁸ The Calends and the Ides belong respectively to the two gods for the same reasons as, on earth, the threshold-hill, the Janiculum, belongs to Janus and the citadel-hill, the Capitol, to Jupiter. In regard to January, the month of Janus, Ovid in his *Fasti* makes insistent use of this philosophy of the two superlatives; discussing the Calends he refers frequently to the *primus* character of Janus (lines 64, 163, 166, 172, 179-80). Then, on the thirteenth of the month, that is, on the first Ides which the poem encounters, he turns to another set of variations, this time on the theme of "greatness," *magnus* (587), and even on the series *magnus*, *maior*, *maximus* (603-6), which is easily associated with the title *Augustus* and which culminates in *summus* (608: *summos cum Joue*)—Varro's very term. This notion is important, since it makes operative, on the Capitol, the second superlative of Jupiter O.M., the first indicating his beneficent goodness or his generosity. In short, Jupiter is at the summit of the *ordo deorum*, even of the *ordo mundi* understood as a pyramid of *maiestates*: he is both *summus* and *maximus*, happy expressions of his "sovereign" character.

Up to this point the figure of Jupiter remains that of the Jupiter in the primitive triad, as revealed by the functions of his flamen and by his position in the ideology of the royal legends. If certain traits are accentuated, if a few are added, they are all appropriate to an essentially sovereign god, enthroned in a sky close to man. But is he only this? Is the description of him in the first function truly restrictive? Is he not an all-powerful god, equally active on the two other levels of war and fertility? Many Latinists have thought so. It would indeed be surprising if he were excluded from such activities. Sovereignty is *sui generis*; alone among the divine "specialties," so to speak, it has by its very nature control over the others, over everything, and without such control it would not be sovereign. Moreover, through his command over rainfall, how could the king of heaven

8. Above, p. 100.

fail to take an interest in agriculture? But at this point two precautions must be taken. One must first fully recognize and analyze the facts under consideration, and not summarily give them general labels in which their originality would be lost; also, taking account of what is said at the end of the preceding chapter, one must observe closely the *manner* of Jupiter's interventions in situations where he appears to be agrarian or warlike.

The facts which are alleged on the agrarian side are not very numerous. First, a few epithets are cited, which one dares not call cultic. They are extracted from the collection of eleven which Saint Augustine accumulated in *The City of God* (7.11 and 12). But *Ruminus*, the epithet which affords the Christian polemist the greatest amusement (half of his chapter 11 is devoted to jokes about the sex of the god), probably does not have the meaning which he gives it—"he who suckles the animals." Wissowa (p. 242), followed by Latte (p. 111), seems to be right in recognizing in the series *Rumina*, *Ruminalis ficus*, Jupiter *Ruminus* the name of Rome itself, with an Etruscan vowel quality (cf. *Rumax* "Roman") scrupulously preserved in the sacred language. Two others, Jupiter *Almus* and Jupiter *Pecunia* (Augustine devotes his entire diatribe in chapter 12 to the latter), would have to be specified with respect to the circumstances of their function, or even merely confirmed. The Jupiter *frugifer* of Apuleius and of a late inscription has a literary look and proves nothing about the origins. Finally Jupiter *Farreus* (Wiss., p. 119) is not so called for any connection he might have with wheat; this epithet is concerned uniquely with the ritual of the most august form of marriage, the *confarreatio*, which owes its name to the wheaten cake held by the bride and groom during the ceremony; in its brevity, the epithet indicates simply that the god, in his ordinary role as guarantor of commitments, presides over the symbolic acts of this ceremony, in which his flamen must take part and which he himself may interrupt with a thunderbolt (Serv. *Aen.* 4.339).

As for the ritual facts, they amount to two. First, in rural religion (Cato *Agr.* 132), there is the banquet, *daps*—consisting in practice of roast meat and a cup of wine, *culigna*, *urna uini*—which is offered to Jupiter before the winter or spring sowing (Fest. pp. 177–78 L²), and from which the epithet *Dapalis* is derived. We may believe that at this point in his toil the peasant addresses himself as a suppliant

to the god who unleashes or restrains the storm. But, in the formula which Cato cites, the whole sense of which is one of offering, with no request, nothing suggests this orientation, and if the peasant has such an idea, he keeps it to himself, in the depths of his mind. The terms employed, *daps* and *pollucere*, suggest something else:⁹ Jupiter is here feasted (such is the nuance, lay and religious, of *pollucere*, a term particularly applied, it seems, to the ravenous Hercules), in a banquet which is, at least symbolically, *amplum ac magnificum*, as Festus says about the derivative *dapaticum*. In short, twice a year the Roman peasant treats Jupiter as does Ovid's Greek peasant, the poor Hyrieus, who offers the visiting god as *daps* the only ox he owns, after his meager vegetables and his wine (Ov. *F.* 5.522). It is clear that Ovid is giving to the Greek legend which he is versifying a coloration influenced by the Roman ritual, and the ritual is illuminated by the story. It is a kind of potlatch operation, in which the peasant, in his own mind, certainly counts on receiving an equal return for his outlay, but without saying so, without revealing his thoughts, without asking for anything. He treats Jupiter like a distinguished visitor requiring his hospitality. In other words, with the coloration proper for rural matters, it is once more in his character as *summus* that Jupiter is being honored here. This interpretation is confirmed by the definitely related ceremony of the *epulum Jouis*,¹⁰ which is urban and without agrarian incidence, and in which Jupiter bears the epigraphically attested surname *Epulo*, which is parallel to *Dapalis*. In the city or in the country, on the Capitol or in the villa, Lord Jupiter wishes an alimentary homage; in the peasant economy this homage amounts only to a roast and a symbolic glass of wine, but among the city-dwellers it consists of a real banquet to the accompaniment of flutes.

The second proof of an "agrarian Jupiter" that has been alleged is the unchallenged attribution to him of the two Vinalia, the *Vinalia rustica* of summer (19 August) and the *Vinalia priora* of spring (23 April). Despite recent objections, the Meditrinalia (11 October) should probably be added to these.¹¹ This attribution is most fre-

9. See the fundamental study by E. Benveniste, "Don et échange dans le vocabulaire indo-européen," *L'Année sociologique*, 1951, p. 17; reprinted in *Problèmes de linguistique générale* (1966), pp. 323-24.

10. Latte, pp. 74 n. 2, 165 n. 2, 377 (but see p. 251!).

11. This sums up "QH. 14-16 ('Juppiter et les Vinalia; le mythe des Vinalia priora; inter exta caesa et porrecta')," *REL* 39 (1961): 261-74, where one will find the earlier bibliography (Bömer, Schilling).

quently interpreted, in naturalistic terms, by Jupiter's role as the god of thunder. Pliny, transcribing Varro and certainly thinking of the August festival, writes *hunc diem festum tempestatibus leniendis institutum* (18.89) and, a little further on (18.284), combining the purposes of three festivals, *tria namque tempora fructibus metuebant, propter quod instituerunt ferias diesque ferios, Robigalia* (25 August), *Floralia* (29 April), *Vinalia* (certainly those of 19 August). Line 419 of the second part of Virgil's *Georgics* has been associated with this description, all the more usefully in that it was not written to justify the festival—*et iam maturis metuendus Jupiter uvis*.

Plausible as it might be for the summer Vinalia, on the eve of the harvest, even there this explanation must be strictly limited. More than half a century ago W. Warde Fowler wrote, "The gift of wine might naturally be attributed to the great god of the air, light and heat." No. In Pliny's phrases as well as in Virgil's verses, it is only a question of the damage (*metuebant*; *metuendus*; *tempestatibus leniendis*) which Jupiter, master of the thunderbolt and the storm, can inflict on the ripening grapes and from which he is asked to abstain. Neither in Pliny nor in the little we know about the rites (Varr. *L.L.* 6.16) is there a question of his taking a positive part in the maturation of the fruit—the only role which would ally him with the so-called agrarian divinities.

There are, however, two difficulties. The weather, the succession of rain and shine, that is to say, the machinery of the naturalistic Jupiter, is no less important for the other crops than for the vineyard; whether by drought or by storm, the fields and the gardens can also be devastated. How does it happen that the requests or the gratitude of men are directed toward Jupiter only in connection with the vineyard? Moreover, the explanation is inadequate, even as concerns the vineyard. The expressions of human gratitude go beyond the precise circumstance under which Jupiter, the master of the storm, has interfered, or rather has refrained from interfering. These expressions are not only the Vinalia at the time of the vintage; they are also the other wine festivals, notably the Vinalia of 23 April, when the first pressings of the new wine are offered to the god before any profane consumption takes place, and, as Pliny says (18.287), it is no longer a question here of the grapes, but of their juice which has already been processed by the art of men: *Vinalia priora . . . sunt VIII Kal. Mai. degustandis uinis instituta, nihil ad fructus attinent*.

Accordingly, without disputing that the Romans may also have thought of protecting their vineyards from the thunderous whims of Jupiter—why did they not exploit all the functions, all the powers of the god to whom they addressed their prayers?—it appears that Jupiter's patronage is justified in other ways, and more fully. In fact, he is not interested in the growth of the grapes, but in their utilization, in their end product, in the wine. To be precise, his first sign of interest begins with the first ripe grape, which the *flamen Dialis* must cut during a sacrifice, *inter exta caesa et porrecta*, as if to take possession of it in the name of the god. His second sign of interest probably relates to the sweet wine which becomes ready some weeks later; while his third and principal interest, in the following spring, is the finished wine. The relationship is not "agrarian," it is not between Jupiter and the plant, but between Jupiter and the wine. And it is the particular affinity between this god and this product which must be understood.¹²

The myth of the Vinalia, which is less artificial than is sometimes said, and which has simply been rejuvenated by its adaptation to the legend of Aeneas, presents only a sovereign Jupiter. According to the commonest variant (though all forms of the legend preserve the essential motif), in consequence of the generous votive offering of all the wine of Latium which Aeneas makes to him, Jupiter gives the Trojan his favor over an impious adversary who has claimed the wine for himself, and delivers Latium to him—a conferring of power by the god who commands power. Here no doubt, as Robert Schilling has pointed out,¹³ is the solution of the problem. Wine is not a product like other products, like bread, like vegetable greens, like fodder. It is not nutritious, it is intoxicating, it has marvelous properties. Drunkenness is not only a plebeian debauchery; through it, in an illusion stronger than reality, man goes beyond himself. This is true in general of the great intoxicating liquors, and by a natural consequence, one frequently sees them claimed, obtained, or stolen by the gods of the higher levels. The thief and principal user of the *soma* is not a divine protector of the plants; it is Indra, the warrior god, who performs his exploits while drunk. The thief and possessor of the best

12. It is remarkable that the name of the Etruscan Jupiter, *Tinia*, survives as the word for *vasa vinaria* (Paul. p. 452 L²; variant, *tinas*, acc. pl., Varro in Non. p. 872 L).

13. *La religion romaine de Vénus depuis les origines jusqu'au temps d'Auguste* (1954), pp. 131-48.

mead is not one of the Vanir, the gods of the fertility of beasts and fields, but Óðinn, the sovereign magician, the king of the gods; and the drunkenness which it creates in him is that which produces science and poetry. Finally, the acknowledged right of Jupiter over this intoxicating drink, the *epulum* which is served to him on the Capitol, and the *daps* with which the peasant regales him—consisting essentially of wine—all derive from the same conception: they are homage rendered to the celestial sovereign, not bargains with an agrarian god.

As for an interest on Jupiter's part in war or in combatants as such, the only archaic ritual that might be adduced is that of the *spolia opima*¹⁴—the spoils of a hostile general killed in action. But the god's interest here is defined and limited by a condition which proves that here too he is located in the zone of sovereignty. According to one of the variant interpretations, all the *spolia opima*—the spoils of an enemy commander won by the Roman commander—are consecrated to Jupiter Feretrius. In the other variant, if Latte's interpretation is correct, as I believe it to be, all the *spolia opima* are taken from an enemy commander, but they are of three kinds, according to whether the conqueror is a Roman general fighting under his own auspices, an officer, or a common soldier: only the first kind goes to Jupiter, while the others are consecrated respectively to Mars and to Quirinus. It is clear that the idea of a Roman commander, and of a supreme commander, is the essential point here. In Livy's account, which follows the first variant, of the dedication made by Romulus after his victory over the king of Caenina, this precise distinction is well expressed (I.10.6): "Jupiter Feretrius, . . . to thee I, victorious Romulus, myself a king, bring the panoply of a king . . ." The transaction takes place between kings, human and divine.

The Roman annalists attributed to Romulus the foundation of a second cult which connects Jupiter with war, that of Jupiter Stator. This event was anachronistically invented on the basis of a considerably later event: the dedication, at the foot of the Palatine, of a temple bearing this name, in fulfillment of the vow made by M. Atilius Regulus in 294. If nothing can be concluded from this dedication with

14. Above, pp. 166-68; on Jupiter Feretrius, see G. C. Picard, *Les trophées romains* (1957), pp. 121, 123.

respect to the origins, the episode reveals at least what was expected of Jupiter on the field of battle during the era when he was being defined and formulated. The victory which Romulus demands and obtains from Jupiter is not the natural result of a well-fought contest but rather a true miracle, a reversal of the course being taken by the battle, which, without the intervention of the god, would end in a disaster for the Romans. "Jupiter," says Livy's Romulus (1.12.4-6), raising his weapons toward the sky, when the flood of his fleeing soldiers has swept him to the very gates of the Palatine, "it was thy omen that directed me when I laid here on the Palatine the first foundations of my City. . . . But do thou, father of gods and men, keep [the foe] back from this spot at least; deliver the Romans from their terror, and stay their shameful flight!" These are not the actions of a "god of war," or of a "warrior god." The means of the miracle are of an order different from physical force or even unshakable courage: by a sudden and inexplicable change of heart, Jupiter transforms the runaways into heroes and gratuitously gives them the advantage which they no longer deserve. That such would have been the probable import of the cult and the meaning of the epithet *Stator* is made clear by the event of 294 and by the vow, which is certainly historical, made by the consul. He "vowed a temple to Jupiter the Stayer [*Stator*]," says Livy (10.36.11), "if the Roman army should stay its flight, and renewing the struggle cut to pieces and overcome the legions of the Samnites." The effect is immediate. In a manifest miracle, the situation is retrieved by a general effort. "It even seemed," Livy continues, "that the divine power of the gods was concerned for the renown of Rome, so easily was the struggle turned . . ." In 207, when Hasdrubal was preparing to cross the Alps in order to join his brother, it was perhaps to this memory, to this recognized ability of the god to reverse desperate situations, that the pontiffs referred when they chose the temple of Jupiter *Stator* as the rehearsal hall for the choir of girls who were to march through the city singing the hymn of Livius Andronicus (Liv. 27.37.7).¹⁵

We can see that the connections, even the legendary ones, between Jupiter and warfare, not merely in the royal epoch but even at the

15. It is not known why, in 146, the praetor Q. Metellus Macedonicus built another temple to Jupiter under this epithet. Probably he had vowed it in a particularly dangerous moment of the difficult war from which he was returning.

beginning of the third century, indicate a character different from that of a warrior god. The mode of action is still more characteristic than the circumstance. As counterproof, at another point in the royal legends, we may mention Jupiter's declared hostility toward Tullus Hostilius, the typical "warrior king" among the four pre-Etruscan kings, and his final destruction of him by a thunderbolt.¹⁶

And so we find the archaic sovereign of heaven completely and coherently described. We might wish that we could observe him during the great crises of history, but for the first and doubtless the most important ones, the historical credibility of the annalistic tradition is too uncertain.

What happened to the cult under Etruscan domination? Under the name of Tinia the Etruscans honored a god whom they had assimilated to Zeus, and whose kinship with Jupiter they themselves acknowledged, as did the Romans. Perhaps the legend of the augur Attus Navius—for the augurs, *interpretes Jouis*, had solid traditions, and Attus Navius was the ornament of the corporation—preserves the memory of a rivalry between the national Roman conception and the conception of the occupying forces. To Tarquin is ascribed the honor of the project of the Capitoline temple, but the idea for other changes has also been attributed to him: he wished to alter the system of the three primitive tribes (and, to judge from their Etruscanized names, *Ramnes*, *Luceres*, *Titienses*, there was in fact some reform in this respect). Attus Navius, who was at that time the most famous of the Roman augurs, declared that no one could meddle in this matter without having observed the birds, that is, without consulting Jupiter in his heaven; according to other sources, on being questioned by the king, he declared that the birds were contrary. Tarquin was irritated, and in order to make fun of an art which annoyed him, he said, "Come now, divine seer! Inquire of your augury [*inaugura*] if that of which I am now thinking can come to

16. See Dumézil, *Aspete*, p. 52. This does not mean that Jupiter had no interest in war—the coinage gives the proof of the contrary (Mattingly, *RC*, pp. 59–60) (Victory, and the triumphant chariot are associated with him), but his contribution to victory was not the same as that of Mars. The two deities are joined on some gold coins of the Republic: "The gold coinage," says Mattingly (p. 55), "marked LX, XXX, XX, has as obverse head of Mars, as reverse eagle or thunderbolt: it is a war coinage under the protection of the supreme god, Jupiter, and the god of war, Mars"; cf. E. A. Sydenham, *Coinage of the Roman Republic* (1952), pp. 25–26.

pass." Navius took up his *lituus*—after that of Romulus, the most famous *lituus* in all Roman legend—observed the sky, and replied affirmatively. The king burst into laughter and drew a razor and a whetstone from under his cloak. "Nay, but this is what I was thinking of," he said, "that you should cleave a whetstone with a razor." Unabashed, Navius took the two objects and the god performed the miracle: the razor cut the stone. Tarquin abandoned his project (Liv. I.36.2-4).

We cannot state exactly the religious intention of the Etruscan kings in the establishment of the Capitoline temple.¹⁷ Among other things, with respect to Jupiter, there was probably an effort to Etruscanize the sovereign deity of the Latins, to whom the college of augurs was certainly not alone in entrusting its resistance and its hopes. The expulsion of the Tarquins halted this process, but, at the same time, the abolition of the kingship and the establishment of the aristocratic republic, and soon afterward the growing conflict between the patrician and the plebeian orders, set their mark on the conception which the liberated Romans held of their god, although without changing it profoundly. A later chapter will be devoted to the Capitoline establishment as a whole. As for Jupiter himself, here is how he appears at the close of the Etruscan crisis.

The ancient Jupiter-Mars-Quirinus triad, obscured in its third element by the new social classifications instituted by Servius Tullius, is definitely unreal. It still exists in a few rituals, but the conceptual structure which it expresses is outmoded. The three *flamines maiores* retain their honorary position, as does the *rex sacrorum* above them, but religious activity and power are in the hands of the *pontifices*.¹⁸ The sovereign god, scarcely limited by his new female associates, finds himself in the best condition to assume the role of "the great god," and not just, as he had been until then, that of the first among the great gods of the state. His majesty is augmented by the fact that he is, through the disappearance of his earthly confrere, the only real *rex* of Rome, the sole survivor of a vanished time and ideology. In fact, even though the annalists sometimes portrayed the ancient kings in imitation of the magistrates (it is possible that the joint kingship of Romulus and Titus Tatius was suggested by the double

17. Below, pp. 307-10.

18. Above, pp. 102-12.

consulate), various reasons support the idea that the two kinds of men were fundamentally different and that the primitive kings were more prestigious and closer to the sovereign god than the most exalted republican holders of the *imperium* would ever be.¹⁹ It was at this time that Jupiter became *Optimus Maximus*—a title for which there is no reason to suppose a Greek provenance, and which coincides with some definitely Roman juridical formulas. In the peroration of his *Pro domo sua*, Cicero says most correctly that the god was called *Optimus propter beneficia et Maximus propter uim*.²⁰

For this very reason, however, Jupiter Capitolinus is in a delicate situation. Throughout the Republican era he prolongs a decayed regime. Beyond the temporary magistrates who evince their respect toward him and whom he consents to inaugurate, he remains the model of that which must no longer be, of that which is officially abhorred, of that which ambitious men sometimes dream of restoring. It comes about that he seems to encourage these men but, in the end, he abandons them, playing simultaneously his two roles of Jupiter *rex* and Jupiter *Liber*, Jupiter *Libertas*, which titles are epigraphically attested and are without doubt to be interpreted in a political sense. In "the uncertainty of history" of the fifth and fourth centuries, if it is not possible to follow developments precisely, the ideology which supports certain famous accounts is no less revealing of what Jupiter was in the eyes of the men of this time. One of the grievances which Camillus, the conqueror of Veii, afforded his detractors was the celebration of his triumph with white horses, a privilege of Jupiter (Liv. 5.23.6); and Camillus was obliged to go into exile. His contemporary Manlius, the most famous of those who

19. From different points of view, this is the thesis of several fine books: S. Mazzarino *Dalla monarchia allo stato repubblicano* (1945) (chap. 2 and 3: *Rex latio i rhesos siculo*," "L'evoluzione del concetto di sacerdozio"); U. Coli, *Regnum* (1951) (4: "Aspetto religioso della regalità; inaugurazione del re"); Catalano, *DA* (Part 3: "Auguria e auspicia in età regia"). In 1944 P. de Francisci published an essay, *Dal regnum alla res publica*, some positions of which he modified in his large book *Primordia Civitatis* (1959). Cf. M. I. Henderson, "Potes-tas regia," *JRS* 47 (1957): pp. 83-87.

20. J. Marouzeau in *CRAI*, 1956, pp. 347-48 (and *REL* 34 [1956] 40-41), thinks that this moral value is not the oldest one, and that *Optimus* would have had a more concrete etymological value, connected with *Ops*. The connection made by this author between Jupiter *Optimus* and *Bona Dea* is unfounded, *Eranos* 54 (1956) (*Mélanges G. Björck*): 227-31. See the discussion by R. Schilling, "A propos de l'expression Juppiter Optimus Maximus," *Soc. Acad. Dacoromana, Acta Philol.* 3 (1964): 345-48. The thesis which maintains that *Maximus* here means "the greatest of Jupiters" (in rivalry with other Latin Jupiters) is most unlikely (Warde Fowler, Pignaniol).

aspired to kingship, goes so far as to have himself assimilated to the Capitoline god whom he had saved from the Gauls; after he is imprisoned, his friends reproach the citizens: "Would they suffer one whom they had well-nigh made a god, and in surname, at any rate, the equal of Jupiter Capitolinus, to be confined in prison, and to draw his breath in darkness, at the mercy of the executioner?" (Liv. 6.17.5). It is not by chance that the *affectatio regni*, like attempts against the Republic generally and high treason, were expiated at the Tarpeian Rock, on the Capitoline Hill.

In the course of history, Jupiter O.M. was naturally associated with the mission of power and conquest which Rome discovered for herself: *regere populos*.²¹ One of the first fictions in this context must have been the omen of the *caput humanum* which was found by excavators digging the foundations of the temple, and which promised to Rome, as a beginning, dominion over Italy. Later we shall see the use which was made of this legend on the occasion of the war with Hannibal.²²

In its most important moments, the struggle between the patriciate and the plebs was burdened with fictions and anachronisms; passion and vanity are not propitious to a serene history. As for the part, active and passive, which the conception of Jupiter took in that struggle, certain constant factors nevertheless stand out from the accounts. Two tendencies are opposed, and then, since Rome must survive, are finally reconciled. On the one hand, as the god of tradition, Jupiter does not favor the progress of the plebs, but holds them back and indicates his dissatisfaction; on the other hand, as god of the state, he does not take an active part in the conflict, but remains the sovereign god of the two parties and, like the patricians, yields to the "movement of history."

A decisive stage was the accession of the plebeians to the consulate, less than a quarter of a century after the Gallic catastrophe (367). There is certainly a foundation of truth in the reasonings which the historians ascribe to the great men of the period. Will Jupiter, who has already had to accept the substitution of the consuls for the *rex*, consent to give the auspices to new men, in other words, to no-

21. We shall observe later, pp. 287-88, the role of the Capitoline temple in Roman life.

22. Below, pp. 463-69.

bodies? After having mocked at the presumption of the plebeians, from the point of view of the *dignitas*, the senator Appius Claudius, a fierce adversary of the project, formulates the much more serious problem of *religiones* which has arisen (Liv. 6.40-41):

... That this City was founded under auspices; that all measures, warlike and peaceful, at home and in the field, are carried out with auspices, who does not know? Who then control the auspices, by the tradition of our fathers? The patricians, to be sure; for no plebeian magistrate is elected under auspices; the auspices belong so exclusively to us, that not only are the patrician magistrates whom the people elect no otherwise elected than with auspices, but we ourselves even—without the people's suffrage—take auspices and nominate an interrex; and have, as private citizens, the right of taking them, which you plebeians have not even in your magistracies. He therefore deprives the state outright of auspices, who by electing plebeian consuls deprives the patricians of them—for they alone can take them.

The fears of the senator were well founded. When, through the influence of Camillus, the patricians end by accepting a compromise, a plague devastates the city and carries off Camillus—an undoubted mark of the dissatisfaction of the god who gives the auspices. The disturbing signs multiply, and in order to restore a state of equilibrium, the miracle of the *lacus Curtius* has to take place, along with the very practical lesson provided by the goddess Earth, whose plebeian affinities are well known: a great abyss opens up in the Forum, and when the Books are consulted, they announce that Earth will close only if she receives that which is most valuable for the Roman people; and further, that from that time and for all time to come she will produce in abundance what she has received. Everyone throws sacred cakes and money into the abyss; nothing happens. Finally one of the principal *iuniores*, Marcus Curtius, famous for his exploits in war and for his wisdom, demands access to the Senate. He explains that the thing most essential to the city of Rome is the bravery of her men, and that if one can be found who will voluntarily sacrifice himself to his country, Earth will produce an abundance of courageous men. Arrayed in his armor and mounted on his war horse, he invokes the gods and hurls himself into the pit. The crowd throws in after him animal victims, cereals, money, precious fabrics, and objects characteristic of all the trades, and Earth closes up (Dion. fragment 14.11; Liv. 7.6.1-6; etc.).

What idea supports this legend? In the politico-religious crisis which is disturbing the Romans, Earth, a friend of the plebs, provides a solution with the consent of the other gods. The auspices, which are the grounds of the quarrel, are put in the background, for the sake of another promise. To the foreground comes the typical warrior, representing all the military youth. Until his intervention, everything that has been thought precious, everything that has been cast into the abyss, has been of no avail. He hurls himself in, an eloquent symbol of the warlike function. After him, and on him, as if on a foundation, the religious and economic offerings of the whole Roman people take on meaning and utility. Over this reformed hierarchy, in which the second function takes the lead and opens the way for the first as well as for the third, Earth, satisfied that she has been understood, puts an end to her riddle, which was menacing only in appearance.²³

And Jupiter—is he satisfied? Not altogether. The event—likewise legendary, and therefore meaningful—which will sanction Tellus's lesson is quick to come, but not without one more indication of Jupiter's ill-humor. Soon afterward, for the first time, a plebeian consul will lead the legions against the enemy. He will be beaten. An army will come in relief, but even though it is led by a patrician consul, the heavenly powers will not aid it. The auspices will sulk all morning long, compromising a total success by their delay. But everything will be saved by the bravery and the costly sacrifice of the cavalry, the young *equites* of whom Marcus Curtius was the mystical forerunner and who will take the whole burden of the battle upon their shoulders at the crucial moment. And so the history of Rome will go on, under the protection of a Jupiter who has resigned himself to events.

Well on in the historical period, however, in 215, when for the first time, apparently without conflict and even with the approval of the Senate (Liv. 23.31.7-8), two plebeian consuls are elected, the god once more emits a sonorous rumbling (ibid. 12-14):

After Marcellus returned from the army, an election to name one consul in place of Lucius Postumius was ordered by edict. With great unanimity [*ingenti consensu*] Marcellus was elected, to assume office at once. Just as he was entering upon his consulship it thundered, and thereupon the augurs,

23. "L'idéologie des trois fonctions dans quelques crises de l'histoire romaine," *Lat.* 17 (1958): 429-46.

being summoned, declared that there seemed to be a defect in his election [*uitio creatum uideri*]. And the fathers widely circulated the statement that it did not meet the approval of the gods that two plebeians had then for the first time been elected consuls. In place of Marcellus, after he had abdicated, Quintus Fabius Maximus was substituted as consul for the third time.

In 215, after Cannae, this divine sign, the majestic thunder, had not yet become a means of trickery and make-believe, as it was soon to be, and it may be imagined that the Romans, patricians and plebeians, augurs and electors, the *Cunctator* as well as the future conqueror of Archimedes, truly thought that it had thundered. This was the last anti-plebeian manifestation that the sovereign deity allowed himself.

Three-quarters of a century earlier, the patrician gods and the plebeian gods—on the one hand Jupiter and Mars together with a rejuvenated Quirinus, on the other hand Ceres and Tellus—had brilliantly demonstrated that they could work together, each in his own way, for the best interests of Rome. In 296, four years after the admission of the plebeians, under the Ogulnian law, into the college of the pontiffs and the college of the augurs, each of the two orders had offered important gifts to the particular gods of the group in whom they took a special interest, these gifts being the products of confiscations. The acknowledgment of the gods was not long in coming. In 295, during a difficult battle, they all manifested themselves in succession, aiding the Romans in accordance with the vicissitudes of the moment. Just before the battle, a wolf chased a doe into the ranks of the enemy and then turned toward the Roman army. One of the *antesignani* cried out that this *uictor Martius lupus* was a sign sent by Mars and by the founder, Romulus. Then, on the left wing the plebeian consul P. Decius Mus, a leader more impetuous than able, who was confronting the Gauls, made a bad beginning of the engagement. He thereupon devoted himself and the enemy host to the goddess Earth, Tellus, the inseparable associate of Ceres, and to the Manes; immediately the situation was retrieved and the *pontifex maximus* could exclaim that *uicisse Romanos, defunctos consulis fato*. Finally, on the right wing the patrician consul Q. Fabius, having exhausted the opposing Samnites, vowed a temple and the spoils of the enemy to Jupiter *Victor*, and captured their camp without difficulty, after their general had fallen in a final desperate attack. A splen-

did joint effort of the gods in the service of the Roman "victory!"²⁴

Finally, if the patricians deliberately and ostentatiously appropriated Jupiter, it seems certain that the plebeians never regarded him as an enemy god but rather as a referee whom they had to convince and win over to their side. Since the plebs were right, how could the god of justice decide against them? I cannot do better than to quote the excellent account of Henri Le Bonniec,²⁵ in which he enlarges on an accurate remark of Jean Bayet.²⁶ It concerns the very beginning of the rivalry between the two orders, the *leges sacratae* (494, 449), which were destined to be the safeguard of the plebeian leaders, the tribunes and the aediles, before they were acknowledged as magistrates of the state. By these laws whoever mistreats or kills a tribune, or causes him to be killed, is *sacer* and can himself be killed with impunity. There is an interesting difference between the formulation by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (6.89.3) of the first *lex* and that by Livy (3.55.6-7) of the second:

M. J. Bayet has compared the texts of the two historians: the sacred law of Dionysius "pronounces against the guilty party a *sacratio*, without specifying any divinity, and the confiscation of his property to the temple of Ceres"; Livy's "vows the head of the guilty party to Jupiter and his property to Ceres, Liber, and Libera." The first formula is definitely the more ancient. "And one is tempted to recognize in the second an actual covenant between the two parts of the population of Rome, Jupiter being the god of the patricians as Ceres is the divinity of the plebeians. However, let us not forget that it was to Jupiter, as we are told, that the plebs had vowed the Mons Sacer when they left it to return to Rome after their first secession."²⁷ In our opinion this reservation is important; it is a happy modification of the too schematic formula which defines Jupiter as "the god of the patricians."²⁸ And even granting that this consecration of the Mons Sacer to Jupiter is "a later enrichment of the tradition" (Bayet), something which is by no means assured,

24. Below, pp. 249-51; "La bataille de Sentinum, remarques sur la fabrication de l'histoire romaine," *Annales: Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 7 (1952): 145-54; reprinted, with considerable changes, as *IR*, pt. II, chap. 3. *Victoria* and *Salus P.R.* will later also become divine beings in the group around Jupiter. There is another conception in J. Bayet, "L'étrange omen de Sentinum," *Coll. Lat.* 58 (*Hommages à A. Grenier*) (1962): 244-56.

25. *Le culte de Cérès à Rome* (1958), p. 347.

26. Livy, Budé collection, vol. 3, 1942, Appendix V, pp. 145-53.

27. Dion. 6.90.1; Fest. p. 414 L² (s.v. *Sacer mons*): *discedentes Joui consacraverunt*.

28. Cf. A. Piganiol, *Histoire de Rome*, 5th ed. (1962 [= 1939]), p. 46: "From the religious point of view, the plebeians are worshipers of the earth goddess, Ceres, and the patricians of the sky god, Jupiter."

it remains nonetheless true that the Plebeian Games were held in honor of Jupiter and that they were doubtless much older than is generally admitted. Further, the rite of the *epulum Jovis* "seems to have been an integral part, at first, of the plebeian games and not of the great September games." Thus we may suspect that the plebeians too, in the beginning, must have worshiped Jupiter, which would after all be wholly normal, given the diffusion among the Italic peoples of the great Indo-European god. It cannot be maintained that the plebs knew only the chthonic gods, even if the latter played a preponderant part in their religion. Therefore, in the formulation of the sacred law according to Livy, we believe that Jupiter occupies the first place because he is the supreme guarantor recognized in common by the plebs and the patriciate. The plebeian triad is satisfied with a material reparation, and the culprit is not sacrificed to these divinities. The plebeians accepted this compromise formula because their own goddess could without loss of prestige give precedence to Jupiter, the sovereign god of the entire community.²⁹

Does the establishment of the cult of Jupiter Victor in 295, on the battlefield of Sentinum, indicate a warlike extension of the god? That may be. Nevertheless the occasion is comparable to the one which gives rise to the cult of Jupiter Stator in the following year. The patrician consul does not make his vow to Jupiter Victor while in a state of panic, asking that the god grant him a miraculous victory over the enemy, or even, as is usual, at the decisive moment, *in ipso discrimine*; he makes it when the battle is practically won and when all that is left to do is to liquidate the enemy. But in a mystical way it is a grave moment. Fabius has just learned of the *deutio* and death of his colleague, and all the weight, all the privileges of supreme command, have settled on his head (Liv. 10.29.12-17). Is it not natural that he should turn to the god of commanders? Two years later tradition attributes to another patrician consul, L. Papirius Cursor, a vow addressed to Jupiter Victor, during a no less famous battle—the one in which he challenges the sacred champions, the *legio linteata* of the Samnites. But was it not precisely because this formidable *legio* was consecrated to the Samnite Jupiter, as he learned from a deserter, by means of dreadful rites and imprecations (ibid. 38.3-12), in a way which could not be pleasing to the god, *nefando sacro, mixta hominum pecudumque caede* (ibid. 39.16)? The form of Papirius's vow is notable (ibid. 42.6-7):

29. In 202 (Liv. 34.39.8) the plebeian aediles, using funds collected from fines, consecrated three statues at the temple on the Capitol, on the occasion of the plebeian games.

Tradition also avers that hardly had there ever been a general more joyous in combat, whether owing to his native temper or to his confidence that he should gain the victory. It resulted from the same stoutness of heart that he was not to be recalled from giving battle by the dispute about the omen, and that in the hour of crisis when it was customary to vow temples to [the] immortal gods, he made a vow to Jupiter the Victor that if he routed the legions of the enemy he would present him with a thimbleful of mead before he drank strong wine himself. This vow was pleasing to the gods and they gave a good turn to the auspices.

Did the cheerful Papirius remember that Jupiter, the patron of all the wine festivals, after being promised the wine of Latium, had granted Aeneas victory over an adversary whom Virgil, following another variant (*Aen.* 8.483–88), describes as abominably inhuman (*infandas caedes; mortua . . . iungebat corpora uiuis*)?

In the slow and limited evolution of Jupiter, when did the influence of Greece, the contagion of Zeus, make itself felt? Very early if, as may be thought, the idea of the Capitoline triad came from Greece by way of Etruria,³⁰ and if, from this time on, his associates Juno and Minerva were being revised on the models of Hera and Athena Polias. But even so, this influence was not profound. It will be plain later on, though with no great effect on the cult, when Jupiter and Juno form a conjugal pair, and later still when the rather un-Roman notion of *fatum, fata* is added to the national *auspicia*.³¹ Jupiter will find himself in the same ambiguous relation with this notion—being the source of the Fates, and yet subject to them—as Zeus with *μοῖρα, εἰμαρμένη*. But this is rather a literary development. In more general terms, it is particularly in literature that Jupiter, whether for good or for bad, has become Zeus. If the dialectical violence in the sixth book of Lucretius (379–422) against the idea of a hurler of thunderbolts applies to the Roman god as well as to the Greek god, the ironies of the second book (633–39), on the “childhood” of Jupiter, are directed against the latter alone. It is to the honor of the poets of the Augustan era that they succeeded in preserving Jupiter’s national meaning, despite the amplifications and extensions suggested by the great models from abroad.

30. See below, pp. 309–10; the Etruscans readily associate three gods in one sanctuary.

31. See below, pp. 497–504.

Even before he took two goddesses as his associates on the Capitol, Jupiter was not alone in his majestic sovereignty. Surrounding him on his own level, and forming theological structures with him, were several Entities, autonomous divinities more or less absorbed by him, or aspects more or less detached from him. First come the divinities of loyalty. One of these, *Dius Fidius*, has already been mentioned. From the same concept is derived a personified idea, *Fides*, for whom A. Atilius Calatinus built a temple on the Capitol, next to that of Jupiter O.M. Here, as we have seen,³² the annual sacrifice of the major flamens took place during the classical era. It is hard to dispute the antiquity of this sacrifice: first, because all the offices of these flamens are ancient, and we do not hear of any of them being created under the Republic; and second, because the ritual itself contains prescriptions of an archaic symbolism. Wissowa (pp. 133-34) is thus right in thinking that the temple dedicated by Atilius replaced a more ancient temple, with or without change of location, something which happened many times. As for disputing the very possibility that an abstract name was personified in the earliest Roman times, this is only one of the forms of the primitivist postulate. How can this branch of the Indo-European family, so adept at juridical abstraction, be denied a practice which is widely represented in the *R̥gVeda* and the *Avesta*, in Greece, and in pre-Christian Scandinavia and Ireland? In all these areas, according to the most ancient documents, certain important divinities were nothing but personified abstractions.

When the history of the kings was constituted in its definitive form *Fides* was given a prominent role in it: she was presented as the favorite goddess of Numa, the founder, as Virgil tells us, of the *sacra* and the *leges*. The reigns of Romulus and Numa were conceived as the two wings of a diptych, each of them demonstrating one of two types, one of the two equally necessary but antithetical provinces of sovereignty. Romulus is a young demigod, impetuous, creative, violent, unhampered by scruples, exposed to the temptations of tyranny; Numa is a completely human old man, moderate, an organizer, peaceful, mindful of order and legality. For Romulus, then, the god who manages affairs and who alone receives the homage of the king is Jupiter, the Jupiter of the auspices, *Feretrius*, *Stator*—in other

32. Above, pp. 144-46.

words, Jupiter in the attributions which relate him to the creative or violent type of Romulus himself. Numa, however, takes his preferences elsewhere. "... Faith, than which there is nothing greater nor more sacred among men," says Dionysius of Halicarnassus (2.75.2-4), "was not yet worshipped either by states in their public capacity or by private persons. As the result of these reflexions [Numa], first of all men, erected a temple to the Public Faith [*Fides Publica*] and instituted sacrifices in her honour at the public expense in the same manner as to the rest of the gods."

This diptych of the first kings was not made up out of nothing. If we do not have to seek historical fact in it, still it expresses a double conception of the "first function" which is found in the theology or the legends of most of the Indo-European peoples. This conception must have existed at Rome, and must have been well understood for long enough to permit its inclusion, along with so many other parts of traditional ideology, in the fictional accounts of the annalists.³³ For Vedic India in particular, the duality of sovereign action is fundamental, and is summed up in the association of two antithetical and complementary gods—Varuṇa, a violent, disquieting god, even in his role as the guarantor of oaths, and Mitra, who is the personification of covenant. The typological parallelism between Romulus and Varuna and that between Numa and Mitra has been observed in great detail, as well as that between the third king, Tullus Hostilius, and the god of the "second level," the warrior Indra. The antiquity of this articulation, and the distinction between the creative and deliberately violent action of the sovereign, even for good, even in defense of justice, and the action of the sovereign who confines himself to the limits of order and of agreements, suggests that perhaps Jupiter and *Dius Fidius* were originally distinct.

Another aspect of *Dius Fidius*—the aspect suggested by *Dius*, "luminous"—finds its antithesis, or in other words its complement, in a scarcely known god, *Summanus*, who raises the same question of evolution with regard to Jupiter as does *Fidius*; for some inscriptions name a *Juppiter Summanus*. Is this an aspect of Jupiter, later more or less dissociated from the great god, or is it really a god

33. This is the theme of my book, *Mitra-Varuṇa, essai sur deux représentations indo-européennes de la souveraineté* (1940; 2d ed., 1948). A new edition, completely revised, is in preparation.

distinct from Jupiter, and later more or less confused with him? In any case, he is the god who must be appeased after nocturnal thunder (Paul. p. 188 L²), since daytime thunder is caused by Jupiter and doubtless by *Dius Fidius*.³⁴ It has been thought, on the basis of a text by Pliny (*N.H.* 2.138), which does not, however, force us to this interpretation, that *Summanus* originated from the fulgural art of the Etruscans. In any case, his name, which means "the nocturnal one," is not of foreign origin, as has been alleged. Formed from *sub* and *mane*, it is parallel to the common word for night in Armenian, *c^h-ayg*, which is formed from *c^h* "until" and *ayg* "dawn" (in the same way that *c^h-erek* "day" is properly "until evening" *erek*). Moreover, the antithesis of "day-night" is one which Vedic religion properly applies to the pair *Mitra-Varuṇa*.³⁵

There is another grouping in which Jupiter figures in an entirely different context. In his Capitoline temple he houses two minor divinities, *Juventas* and *Terminus*. A legend (Dion. 3.69.5-6; etc.) relates that when the deities installed on the Capitol were being exaugurated to make room for the temple of Jupiter O.M., they all withdrew docilely save these two, for whom chapels then had to be maintained in the new building. This obstinacy seemed to be a good omen; it was said that it guaranteed to Rome a perpetual youth on its chosen site. Later, in an audacious reversal, the omen of *Terminus* promised a limitless empire to Rome, the capital of the world. The antiquity, and sometimes the authenticity, of this association have sometimes been questioned.

According to some authors *Juventas* is only an expression of the Greek *Hebe*, and would not have become a Roman goddess but for the occasion of the *lectisternium* and the *supplicatio* offered in 218 "to Hercules and to *Juventas*" (Liv. 21.62.9). For some reason which is not easy to imagine, they say she was then admitted into the temple of Jupiter O.M. In truth, it is hard to believe that at this date an artificial and foreign goddess should have been housed in this place; and it is an underrating of the indications which the antiquarians have given concerning this divine personification who, in

34. Cf. the probably intentional connection between *Summanus* (as the name of a freed-man) and *somniare* in Plaut. *Curc.* 546.

35. A new attempt at etymology is made in A. L. Prosdocimi, "Etimologie di teonimi: Venilia, Summanus, Vacuna," *Studi linguistici in onore di V. Pisani* (1969), pp. 777-802.

the forms *Juuentus*, *Juventas*, or the obviously archaic *Juuenta*, was the goddess of the *iuvenes*, the *noui togati*. Age groupings certainly played an important part in Rome's earliest organization, and in this connection we are struck by two facts (Wiss., p. 135): first, that every young man assuming the *toga uirilis* had to "go to the Capitol," to the house of Jupiter (Serv. *Ecl.* 4.50), to whom several inscriptions give the title of *Juppiter Juuentus*; and second, according to the analogistic tradition (Piso in Dion. 4.15.5), that Servius Tullius, the founder of the entire social structure, should have imposed on every boy entering manhood the obligation to put money into the coffer of the goddess Youth. Perhaps *Juventas* was an aspect of Jupiter, subsequently disjoined from the god, but she was certainly not an intruder, a latecomer: it was not Hebe who provided these rites.³⁶

As for *Terminus*, it has been occasionally objected that, in early times, there existed neither an altar to *Terminus* nor a god named *Terminus*, but only a cult of boundaries themselves, that is, the boundaries of private property, and that it was unlikely there was ever any private property on the Capitol: therefore there could have been no cult of *Terminus* on the hill prior to that of Jupiter O.M. Of course, but this argument is valid only against the legend of the obstinate gods and not against an ancient affinity between boundaries and Jupiter, whom an inscription of the *ager Ravennas*, up to now the only one of its kind, calls *Juppiter Ter.* (CIL, XI, 351).

Indeed, the simultaneous association of *Juventas* and *Terminus* with Jupiter has a meaning which a comparison with the facts of Indo-Iranian mythology makes clear.³⁷ On the sovereign level, close to the two great gods *Varuṇa* and *Mitra*, but more strictly associated with *Mitra*, there existed two "minor sovereigns," *Aryaman* and *Bhaga*, the former, patron of the society of the "Arya"; the latter, "share" personified, patron of the fair apportionment of goods in society. Zoroastrian transpositions guarantee the antiquity of this structure, the meaning of which is clear: the great sovereign god has two adjuncts, one of whom cares for the persons constituting society, the other for the goods which they share. Such was probably the value, before amplifications, of the notions of *iuventas* and *terminus*.

36. A *templum Juuentatis*, vowed in 207 by the consul M. Livius Salinator (in action against Hasdrubal), was dedicated in 191 (Liv. 35.36.5).

37. DIE, chap. 2 ("Les dieux souverains"), pp. 40-78; the table on p. 42 can be improved; see *Aspekte*, pp. 3-5.

The former, personified, controls the entry of men into society and protects them while they are of the age most important to the state, while they are *iuuenes* or *iuniores*; the latter, personified or not, protects or defines the division of property, not so much movables (chiefly herds), as in the case of Bhaga, but rather property based on land, as is normal in a definitely sedentary society. It is possible that these two interests of sovereignty should have first given rise to two "aspects" of Jupiter, which would themselves later have been detached from the god. But the homologous nature of the Indo-Iranian facts suggests that the conceptual analysis is an ancient, pre-Capitoline one and that Jupiter brought along to the ultimate site of his principal cult two expressions of his nature, two functions of his activity which were just as ancient as he himself. As for the legend of the stubborn gods, it may have arisen, like the legend of the human head, when the Romans began to demand great promises from Jupiter, and soon afterward promises of empire, which his position at the time of the villages on the Palatine would not have allowed. Granting an extension beyond the limits of their definition, Juventas and Terminus would then have signified Rome's youth and stability (Dion. 3.69), *firma omnia et aeterna* (Flor. 1.7.9). As Jupiter himself says to Venus in the lovely opening of the *Aeneid* (1.278-79), in his discourse where each word is meaningful and where other structures are also alluded to (the pre-Capitoline triad: the speaking Jupiter, Mars [274], Quirinus [292]; and the Capitoline couple, Jupiter and Juno [279]):

*His ego nec metas rerum nec tempora pono,
imperium sine fine dedi . . .*

Moreover, considering that the boundary, from its humble beginnings, was the mark of a right which often resulted from a contract, and that it thus bore witness to the human relations of neighbors, why did not its religion belong to the "first function"? It is only one particular instance of the religion of Bona Fides, as the Romans well knew, who gave as Numa's favorite divinity sometimes Fides, sometimes Terminus, and sometimes both of them. It is not history, but rather authentic Roman ideology which is expressed in chapter 16 of Plutarch's *Life of Numa*:

He was also the first, they say, to build temples to Faith and Terminus; and he taught the Romans their most solemn oath by Faith, which they still continue to use. Terminus signifies *boundary*, and to this god they make public and private sacrifices where their fields are set off by boundaries; . . . And it is quite apparent that it was this king who set bounds to the territory of the city, for Romulus was unwilling to acknowledge, by measuring off his own, how much he had taken away from others. He knew that a boundary, if observed, fetters lawless power; and if not observed, convicts of injustice.

It was natural that a marker, "somehow an official representative of all boundary stones" (Latte), should be placed in the temple of the guarantor of justice and of good faith; natural also that a public festival, the Terminalia of 23 February, celebrated at the sixth milestone of the Via Laurentina (Ov. *F.* 2.679), which was perhaps an ancient boundary of the *ager Romanus*, should honor this important symbol of human relations. Even in the private rites of this day, as Ovid pleasantly describes them, the contractual aspect, the friendship formed and sustained by respect for law, is in evidence. The neighbors synchronize their actions and join together in happy celebration of the boundary. "Thou art crowned by two owners on opposite sides; they bring thee two garlands and two cakes" (*F.* 2.643-44). After the rustic offerings (wheat, honey, wine, the blood of a lamb or of a young pig), "the simple neighbours meet and hold a feast, and sing thy praises, holy Terminus; thou dost set bounds to peoples and cities and vast kingdoms; without thee every field would be a root of wrangling." Like Jupiter, the patron of true justice, the genius of the boundary is not *litigiosus*.³⁸

The greater part of the documents which give information regarding the Jupiter of the other Italic peoples date from a time in which Roman domination left, to the sovereign god of the vanquished, no choice but to become an aspect of the Roman Jupiter,³⁹ or to be reduced to some limited activity, some secondary development of

38. A. Magdelain, *REL* 40 (1962): 224-27, has emphasized another aspect of the Terminalia, and hence of Terminus: their meaning of "end" or "conclusion" or "termination" in the calendar year.

39. On the contrary, C. Koch, *Der römische Jupiter* (1937), places the Italic and the Roman Jupiters in opposition. It is not possible, in the present state of the documentation, to make any statement about *Vedius*, *Veivius*; in spite of its second term, this compound designates a god who is not Jovian. The ancients often saw in him an infernal god; but what was he before the *interpretationes graecae*? See Latte, p. 81 and n. 3.

his ancient function. Moreover, very few of these local Jupiters have been described clearly enough to allow any definition of their type. Thus, despite much ingenuity, scholars have not discovered the meaning of the Lavinian Jupiter's epithet *Indiges*, which is itself obscure and, according to some Roman authors at least, was shared by Aeneas. Nevertheless, some surnames recall the titles or the functions known at Rome: *Praestes* at Tibur, *Maius* (cf. *Maiestas*) at Tusculum; *Liber*, notably at Furfo (among the Sabellians); in Oscan territory *Lucetius*, *Lúvfreis* (gen.) "Liberi," *Regaturei* (dat.), probably "Rectori." The Jupiter *Anxurus* of the Volscians was portrayed as beardless,⁴⁰ seated on a throne, and holding a scepter. The *Arcanus* of Praeneste had miraculously provided the city with "lots," by which it regulated its actions. The Umbrian ritual of Iguvium is sufficient proof of the preeminence of *Jou-* in theology and in worship. But the most interesting of all, because he was annexed to Rome at a very early date and continued to play an important role in the shadow of the Capitol, is Jupiter *Latiaris*, a *deus antiquissimus* (Serv. *Aen.* 12.135) who was worshiped on the Alban Hills.⁴¹ One of the first acts of the new consuls was to go to sacrifice to him (*sacrum in monte*; Liv. 21.63.5; etc.). The *feriae Latinae*, celebrated with the participation of all the cities of Latium, demonstrated every year that Rome was truly and definitely the heir of the successive hegemonies and confederations that can be dimly seen in the first glimmerings of history.

40. But this indication (Serv. *Aen.* 7.799) is obviously founded on a pun, *ἀνευ ξυπόῦ* "without razor."

41. The bibliography of this Jupiter is considerable, and the evaluation of him made by the various authors depends on the idea they have concerning the relations between Rome and the Latins; see the essential elements in Catalano, *SSR*, pp. 170-75, with the notes.

4

MARS

In all the epochs which are accessible to us, the common sentiment of the Romans ascribed the province of war to *Māuors*—*Mars*. Certain moderns have opened Byzantine discussions: should one say “god of war” or “god of warriors” or “warrior god”? Do there really exist in antiquity pure “gods of war,” “warrior gods,” who are nothing but that? These verbal quibbles leave intact the impression which is derived from an immense dossier. For almost a century now, since the rigorous investigations of Wilhelm Mannhardt into European folklore opened the way to a much less rigorous agrarian mythology, and even, in the books of the master’s disciples, to an aggressive kind of “panagrarianism,” much more important discussions have taken place: in the beginnings, was not Mars a great, all-powerful god, in particular as much agrarian as warlike, or even more agrarian than warlike? The Latinists have shared in this discussion. Fifty years ago, G. Wissowa forcefully defended the warlike Mars against W. Roscher, H. Usener, and especially A. von Domaszewski, and today one is pleased to see a Kurt Latte (p. 114, n. 4) reject, in the same sense, the most recent propositions of an H. J. Rose which, in order to create still further confusion, have brought the hunt into this matter. These controversies have been most useful. It is perhaps on the “agrarian Mars” that the successive methods which have been applied to the study of Roman religion make the best demonstration of their strength or of their weakness.

The calendar as well as sacred topography, literature as well as inscriptions, the legends about the first centuries as well as the history of the last, furnish superabundant proofs of the essential rapport of Mars with war.

The cycle of his festivals is divided into two groups, the one (the month of March with some extensions) opening, the other (the month of October) closing the warlike season. In the spring these are the Ecurria (Equirria)¹ with their races on the Campus Martius (27 February and 14 March), the lustration of arms on the Quinquatrus (19 March) and that of the trumpets on the Tubilustrium (23 March, 23 May); in October, there are the ritual of the October Horse on the Ides and the lustration of arms on the nineteenth, to which we must surely add, on the Calends, the ritual of the *tigillum sororium*,² explained by the legend of the young Horatius, representing the type of warrior who is submitted to a purification after the necessary or superfluous violences of war.

Until the founding of temple and cult by Augustus in favor of Mars Ultor, the avenger of Caesar (*pro ultione paterna*, Suet. Aug. 29.2), the sanctuaries of Mars conformed to one rule, explicitly formulated: as a kind of sentinel, he has his place not in the city, where peace should reign, where the armed troops do not enter, but outside of the precincts, on the threshold of the wilderness which is not, though it has been so called,³ his domain, but from which come dangers, and especially the armed enemy. There is on the *campus* which bears his name a very ancient altar, *ara Martis in campo*, which a temple was finally to complete, in 138 B.C., in fulfillment of a vow by D. Junius Brutus Callaicus. There is also the famous *templum Martis extra portam Capenam*, near which were concentrated the armies destined to operate south of Rome (Liv. 7.23.3) and from which the great religious parade of the cavalry departed, the *transuectio equitum*, whose brilliance astounded Dionysius of Halicarnassus (6.13.4). The temple of the Porta Capena is one of the Roman sanctuaries which have been the most long-lived: dedicated in the beginning of the fourth century B.C. by the *duumvir* T. Quinctius in fulfillment of a vow made during the Gallic drama, it lasted for more than eight hundred years. It was without doubt the emperor Honorius who destroyed it when he repaired Aurelian's wall at the expense of the neighboring edifices, and it is thought that the blocks of marble

1. On this word, see J. Loicq, "Le témoignage de Varron sur les Ecurria," *Lat.* 33 (1964): 491-501.

2. On the extraordinary transformation of *sororius*, "of the sister," into an adjective meaning "of the time of swelling, of puberty," see above, p. 50, n. 3.

3. Latte, in *ARW* 24 (1926): 250-51.

used in the reconstruction of the Appian Gate come from this ancient witness of the grandeurs of Rome. The *sacrarium Martis* of the Regia, in Rome, does not contradict the rule of exteriority: it is only the depository for sacred objects connected with war, and it was necessary, in this synthesis of all the functions which constitutes the "house of the king," that the warlike function should be present.

These sacred objects of the Regia, like the services which the Romans expect from them, are purely warlike in nature: the bucklers and the lance or lances of Mars (doubtless, in the earliest times, the lance which represented Mars, the "lance called Mars") which the general chief came to touch before assuming his command, while saying "*Mars uigila.*"

The ritual invocations of the pontiffs paired many masculine divinities with personified abstractions which, in a more picturesque mythology, would have been their spouses and which, in some cases, did indeed receive this promotion. In the list cited by Aulus Gellius (13.23.2), a Nerio and some Moles are thus associated with Mars. The Moles, epigraphically confirmed, doubtless refer to the dynamic "masses" (*moles*) which war powerfully stirs up (*moliri*).⁴ Setting aside the glossarial adjective *nerosus*, the name of Nerio is the sole survival in Latin of the term **ner-* which, to judge by Indo-Iranian and also by Umbrian usage, was opposed in Indo-European to **uiro-* as man considered in his heroic aspect is opposed to man—the producer, the begetter, the begotten, the slave—considered as a demographic or economic element;⁵ this archaic name, which would be translated approximately into classical Latin by *uirtus*, since *uir* was charged with the ancient values of the vanished **ner*, recalls the Vedic *nárya*, distinct from *vīryā*. Thus it rightly locates Mars in the domain which, among the Indo-Iranians, furnished the very name of the god who was his homologue, Indra (**ənro-*) "the heroic." The analysis of the conditions, of the component factors of success in combat which Moles and Nerio present, recurs in Scandinavian mythology, which gives as sons to Þórr, a god partially homologous

4. There is no reason for seeing in *moles*, in this usage, transposition of the Greek *μῶλος*. When Liv. (10.19.19) writes *fugant hostes, maiorem molem haud facile sustinentes quam cum qua manus conserere assueti fuerant*, he is speaking a Latin which owes nothing to the Greek. It has been observed above, p. 161, that *Moles Martis* nicely balances *Virites Quirini*.

5. "*ner-* et *uiro-* dans les langues italiques," REL 31 (1953): 175–89; reprinted in IR, pt. II, chap. 6. Nerio is found associated with Mars on a *denarius* of Cn. Gellius, about 146 B.C., Mattingly, RC, p. 72 and pl. XVI 4.

to Indra and Mars, two masculine derivatives of abstractions, *Magni* and *Móði*: *megin* is actually "physical power" (the magical girdle which gives Þórr his extraordinary strength is called, in the plural, *megin-gjarðar*), and *móðr* is the warlike "madness" (in German, *Wut* rather than *Mut*) which principally characterizes Þórr and his regular adversaries, the giants (cf. *jötun-móðr* "giant madness").

Mars is the principal god, in the ancient epoch doubtless the only god, associated with the old Italic practice of the *uer sacrum*, which, in the heart of their definitive habitat, extended the practice of gradual occupation of the soil which had led the Indo-Europeans far away from their point of departure. In a difficult situation, a group of men religiously took the decision to swarm, to make the generation which was in the process of being born leave its territory when it reached adulthood. When they came to maturity, Mars took charge of the expelled children, who were still only a band, until, by the submission or the expulsion of earlier occupants, they had founded a new sedentary community, and it happened that the animals which were consecrated to him led these *sacrani* and became their eponyms: a wolf (*hirpus*) had thus guided the Hirpini, a woodpecker (*picus*) the Picentes, while the Mamertini took their name directly from that of Mars himself. Of the two concurrent traditions regarding the origins of Rome, one seems to rest on a *uer sacrum* of which the other speaks directly. The latter related that such *Sacrani* coming from Reate had chased away the indigenous Liguri and Siculi from that which was later to become the Septimontium (Fest. p. 414 L²), and it is well known how the legend which has become canonical tells of the founding of Rome by the sons of Mars, nurslings of the she-wolf, who had voluntarily departed from Alba.

In war, the only association of Mars is with combat. That which juridically precedes hostilities up to the *indictio belli* does not concern him: the *fetiales* depend on Jupiter, not on him. He is not even named in the declaration of injustice by which the *fetialis* begins his procedure and for which he calls to witness the two other gods of the primitive triad, Jupiter and Quirinus.⁶ If it is true that the lance is

6. Although Mars has been frequently represented on coins, he is not among the gods who share the various denominations in the libral series probably because this series is exclusively commercial. Starting with Janus, who, as master of all beginnings (below, p. 328), has the *as*, the first of the series, these gods are Saturn (*semis*; rather than Jupiter), interpreted as god of abundance; Minerva (*triens*), as goddess of the craftsmen (although

a symbol of Mars, however, it is this god who comes into action, and he alone, at the end of the proceedings, when the *fetialis*, without any invocation, opens hostilities by hurling onto enemy soil *hastam ferratam aut sanguineam praeustam* (Liv. 1.32.12).⁷ When victory is won, he is among the gods *quibus spolia hostium dicare ius fasque est* (Liv. 45.33.2), but even there the victorious general preserves a spacious freedom, and the technician-divinities of destruction, Volcanus, Lua, come forward at his choice. These observations are not contradicted by the fact that, in actual combat, the general often formulates the vow of an offering, of a temple or of worship in case of victory, directed to a god other than Mars, and sometimes to one far removed from his type; and further, that such vows are rarely directed to Mars himself. Battle and victory are not the same thing, even though good leadership and good performance of the former may bring about the latter. Mars makes one fight; he breaks loose, *saevit*, in the arms and in the weapons of the combatants; to be sure, he is for Rome *Mars pater*, but he is also *Mars caecus*, and one may imagine that, in order to orient this force, at the decisive moment of the struggle, *in ipso discrimine*, with the outcome still in doubt, the general appeals to a divinity less involved in the intoxicating detail of action.⁸ Naturally, however, this difference is not an opposition, and Mars can cease to be blind and alone lead to its conclusion the vengeance of the Romans.

Such is Mars. It must be said that his characteristics are more reminiscent of the Greek Ares to whom the theologians assimilate him than of the fighting gods of the Indo-Iranians and of the Germans. An important variation has already been noticed: while the thunderbolt belongs to his homologues Indra and *pórr*, it is not he who fulminates, but Jupiter. In a parallel way, he does not have a naturalistic aspect; his abode, the place of his signs, is not the atmosphere, which also belongs to Jupiter; his animals are terrestrial, save for the wood-

she is represented with a helmet, according to her Greek *interpretatio*); Hercules (*quadrans*), as protector of the merchants (below, pp. 433-39); Mercury (*sextans* and *semuncia*), as god of trade (below, pp. 439-40); Bellona (*uncia* and *quartuncia*), who helps to win the wars, but also to avoid them (below, pp. 382-83).

7. *sanguineam* has been interpreted as "made of cornel wood" by J. Bayet, "Le rite du fécial et le cornouiller magique," *MEFR* 52 (1935): 29-76.

8. Cf. frequent expressions used by the poets and the historians, such as Livy (10.28.1): *Ceterum, quamquam communis adhuc Mars belli erat, necdum discrimen fortuna fecerat, qua datura vires esset . . .* (the same construction *Martem communem belli fortunamque* at 5.12.1).

pecker, which flies close to the ground; it is on the ground that he is at home and it is here that the Romans seek or find him or his symbols; in times of peace his domain is the "field" of Mars; in times of war he is with the army.

But the Roman army, when we make its acquaintance, is equally far removed from what the bands of Indo-European warriors had been. Its equipment has been renovated, and it no longer has even the memory or the technique of chariot warfare, which survives only on the racetracks. The legion is the granddaughter of the skillful phalanx, and in it discipline counts for more than *furor*, the motive of the ancient victories.⁹ Single combats are exceptional. While remaining more savage than the men he inspires, Mars has had to follow the course of evolution. In 282 he intervenes in a battle against the Brutians and the Lucanians (Val. Max. 1.8.6): in this territory marked by Greek influence, he proceeds in the manner of the Dioscuri, incognito. The legions of C. Fabricius Luscinus, at first hesitant, have been swept on to the assault and to victory by a young soldier of exceptional stature who suddenly appeared. After the battle they look for him in order to give him the *corona uallaris*, awarded to the first Roman soldier to scale the enemy's ramparts: they do not find him. "It was then discovered," says Valerius Maximus, "and it was immediately believed that *Mars pater* had in this circumstance helped his people. Among other certain indications of his intervention, the helmet with the double crest which adorned the head of the god was mentioned." Mars has made himself a model legionary, and, at the end of the battle, has vanished.

Rome lost even the memory of those bands of warriors who sought to be more than human, on whom a magico-military initiation was supposed to confer supernatural powers, and whose likeness was presented, very much later, by Scandinavia with its Berserkers and by Ireland with its Fianna. Other Italic peoples, in their confrontations with the Romans, put their hopes in "*sacрати milites*."¹⁰ Several

9. See the first chapter of Dumézil, *Horace et les Curiaces*, pp. 11-33 ("Furor"), and the third of *Heur et malheur du guerrier* (1969), translated as *The Destiny of the Warrior* (1970). There is no reason to think that the Homeric verb *μαίνεσθαι* (used for Ares) is the "direct model" for *sæuit* (applied to Mars).

10. Another conception in S. Tondo, "*Il sacramentum militiae*" nell'ambiente culturale romano-italico (1963), notably pp. 113-21. See L. Gerschel, "Couleur et teinture chez divers peuples indo-européens," *Annales: Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations*, 21 (1966): 608-31.

times Livy takes note of them in the Samnite wars; in 9.40.9 he shows the Samnites dressing a part of their troops, *sacratos more Samnitium milites*, in white and arming them with silver bucklers; then, in 10.38, for the decisive battle, the *legio linteata* of this vigorous people forms itself under our eyes, slowly, following an archaic procedure and ritual revived for the occasion by a very aged priest who declares *se id sacrum petere ex uetusta Samnitium religione*: bloody sacrifices in a secret enclosure, terrible oaths exacted from the nobles and from the notable warriors, co-optation, splendid armor, white vestments; it is truly, to follow the expression of the historian, a *sacrata nobilitas* which leads its army to battle. At Rome, the last representatives of these forms of simultaneously heroic and magical armies perhaps do exist, but they do not fight; these would be the teams of Salian priests, whom we shall examine later when we compare Mars and Quirinus. Their armed dances remind us that among the most ancient Indians, Indra and his companions, the band of young Marut warriors, all adorned with golden plates, are "dancers," *ṛtú*.

This transformation of military activity is accompanied by a transformation of the corresponding vocabulary, all the more striking because a fair number of terms of the "first function" have, on the contrary, been faithfully preserved. Latin has nothing corresponding to the technical Indo-Iranian word for the warlike function and for the power resting on force, Vedic *kṣatrá*, Avestan *xšaθra*, Scythian *Ḫarpa-*, *Ḫapra-* (while, at the same time, of the names of the two other functions, *bráhmaṇ* probably reappears in *flāmen* and *viś* surely in *uīcus*); vanished are the names of the "mighty hero," Vedic *śūra*, Avestan *sūra* (preserved in Celtic, OIr. *caur* "hero," Old Welsh *cawr* "giant"); of the "headstrong young man," Vedic *márya*, Avestan *mairya* (the connection with *maritus* is unlikely and would not preserve anything of the warrior idea); the Indo-Iranian names for the army, for victory, for battle (*iubere* does not correspond directly to *yudh* "battle," *yúdhyati* "he battles," which subsists in Celtic: *iud-* in Brythonic proper names) do not appear in Latin, nor does that for the enemy (Vedic *śatru*: cf. Old Welsh *catu-*, OIr. *cath*, OHG *hadu* "battle"); an essential verb of the warrior function, "to kill" (Ved. *han-*, etc.) survives only in a domesticated form in *offendo*, *defendo*, *infensus*; the fundamental quality of the Vedic warrior, *iṣirá*, *iṣmīn* "furious," subsists only with a loss of value in the word for anger

ira (**eisā*-); the Vedic *ójas* and the Avestan *aojah* "physical force," a term characteristic of the second function, has been promoted to the first, applied to another order of force, and purified under the guises of *augur* and of *augurium*. In compensation, all the ideas on this level received new names at Rome, whether indigenous (*miles*, *exercitus*, *legio*, *for(c)tis*, *impetus*, *certamen*, *praelium*, *pugna*, *hostis*, *infestus*, *caedere*, *occidere*, etc.) or borrowed (*triumphus*, perhaps *classis*, *dimicare*).

This constant divergence, which the divine figure of Nerio is not enough to compensate for, invalidates beforehand an etymology which has often been proposed for the very name of Mars. Except for the strange, perhaps Sabine, *Marmar* (*Marmor*) in the *carmen* of the Arvales, and the Oscan *Mamers* which may be the reduction of a neighboring form (**Marmart-s*),¹¹ all the Italic variants lead to *Māuort-*. In the middle of the nineteenth century a comparison was attempted, based on a known alternation (even in Latin, *quatuor* and *quadru-*), between this name and the name of the warrior companions of Indra, the mythical "Männerbund" of the Vedic hymns, *Marút-* (attested also in the Cassite pantheon); it was formerly even thought that the technical Vedic expression *śárdho Márutam*, "the warrior band of the Marut," was to be found in one of the enigmatic entities qualified as "martial" by the Umbrian ritual of Iguvium, *Çerfus Martius*. But the vocalic quantity is different, *a* is long in Latin, short in Vedic (*Máruta-*, which has just been cited, is an adjective derived from *Marút* by regular lengthening of the initial syllable), and *Marút* seems to have been formed on the root from which *márya* derives (cf. Greek *μείραξ*, *μειράκιον*), by a suffix *-ut* of which there are other examples in Vedic but which cannot be attributed to Indo-European times.

As for the affinities of Mars for one of the social classes which were established at Rome, the sudden importance which legend gives him after the transition from the Kingdom to the Republic has already been indicated.¹² Later, during the difficulties between the patriciate and the plebs, he remained a patrician, if one may interpret in this sense the popular story which justifies the plebeian merrymaking on 15 March, the festival of Anna Perenna. She, an aged woman of the town

11. A. Ernout, *Philologica* 2, (1957): 209-15. On the name of the god, see A. G. Ramat, "Studi intorno ai nomi del dio Marte," *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 47 (1962): 112-42.

12. See above, p. 155.

of Bovillae, is supposed to have secretly revictualled the plebs during its retirement on the Mons Sacer and, after her death, she is said to have been deified. Barely promoted to godhood, she is supposed to have made a fool of Mars, in love with Minerva, whose festival closely follows 15 March: Anna Perenna, according to the legend, appeared before the god in the habiliments of Minerva (Ov. *F.* 3.661-96). Whatever the origin of this anecdote, which gave rise to popular comedies, it seems to attest that Mars was not recognized as their god by the plebeians, who were, moreover, so often opposed to the wars which the patricians used to wage at that time.¹³

We must now open the great debate. This god whose warlike vocation we have hastily investigated—was he not, had he not been from the beginning an “agrarian Mars”? Is not the type which has just been described one aspect among others, which has become predominant over others, of a “great god” having a much more general significance?

The area of discussion today is more reduced than it was half a century ago. The most recent defenders of the agrarian Mars seem to have abandoned the extreme positions which made of this god a “Jahresgott” (Usener) or a god “des Sonnenlebens der Natur” (Domaszewski). Nobody argues any longer from the position of the month of March in the year, or from the allocation of the chief festivals of the god to March and to October, to spring and to fall—all facts which are justified enough, in the line of his character, by the necessities of warlike activity among the ancient Italic peoples. Domaszewski was very far advanced on this track.¹⁴ After having mentioned the Lupercalia of February, he wrote, “This strange race of the wolf-cubs is also the day on which the estival life of nature is born, which, through a growth of marvelous rapidity, on the day of Mars’s birth, the first of March, reveals itself in this god. . . . Two weeks: that is all it takes for the no less marvelous growth of the god who, on 17 March, the day of the Liberalia and of the *agonium martiale*, is already a man.” The Salii, according to this imaginative author, protect the newborn Mars as the Curetes of Cretan myth danced and

13. L. Gerschel, “Coriolan,” *Eventail de l’histoire vivante (Hommages à L. Febvre)* 2 (1954): 13-40.

14. *Abhandlungen zur römischen Religion* (1909), pp. 176-77, 180.

clashed their weapons in order to protect the infant Zeus from malevolent forces; if they dance, it is "in order to keep away from the little boy the hostile demons of winter." As for the festivals in October, all the rites there "make reference to the resurrection of Mars which will take place the following year." Not one text authorizes these enthusiastic propositions.

No longer can one really base an argument on the popular ritual of Mamurius Veturius;¹⁵ on the fourteenth of March (or on the fifteenth), the mob led in procession a man covered with skins and beat him with long white wands while calling him Mamurius (Lyd. *Mens.* 4.49).¹⁶ This ritual, it was said, concerned the blacksmith who had reproduced in eleven indistinguishable copies the *ancile* which fell from heaven in Numa's time; later, after some disappointments, the Romans had felt guilty for this kind of disloyalty to the unique sign which had been given to them and, holding the artist responsible, had expelled him from the city while beating him with wands; of anyone who received a thrashing it was said vulgarly that he "played Mamurius." Here plainly is the Roman form of a springtime ritual of which Mannhardt has given numerous examples: the expulsion of the old year, doubtless here "the old March" or "the old one of March"; the date, in the middle of the month, seems to agree with this name, the first fortnight being perhaps the old one, still attached to the preceding year, and the second, the young one, opening the new year. But at this point the rights of interpretation stop: whatever one may think about the legend of Mamurius, his name, in this ritual, makes reference to the month, not to the god, and there is no automatic connection between a month and its eponym. Once named after the god Mars for a particular reason, the first month of the ancient year lived its own folkloric life: the rites of the changing year have been covered by its appellative, personified

15. There is no reason for attributing to the Etruscan (for example A. Ernout, in *RPh.* 32 [1958]: 151, n. 1) this double name of apparently popular formation: the ritual takes place in March and it certainly concerns the expulsion of the "old one." See a new opinion in J. Loicq, "Mamurius Veturius et l'ancienne représentation italique de l'année," *Coll. Lat.* 40 (*Hommages à J. Bayet*) (1964): 401-25.

16. This rite is probably represented on a third century A.D. mosaic calendar (below, p. 559, n. 14). H. Stern, "La représentation du mois de mars sur une mosaïque d'el-Djem," *Mélanges A. Piganiol* 2 (1966): 597-609, and "Un calendrier romain illustré de Thysdrus," *Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei* 365 (1968): 179-200, in connection with another mosaic in the Borghese Casino, which R. Herbig and A. Alföldi have interpreted otherwise. Stern gives important reasons for preferring the date of 15 (not 14) March.

in an Oscan form, *Mamurius*. The same process was reproduced later for February, which became the "consul Februarius," the wicked rival of Camillus;¹⁷ this impostor is said to have been expelled from the city with blows of switches and furthermore the Romans are supposed to have docked two days from the month to which his name had been given. In this way the problem which many folklores have posed was solved: "Why does February have only twenty-eight days?" It is clear that the expulsion of the "consul Februarius" tells us nothing about the *februa*, the purifications which are the true origin of the month's name; the expulsion of the "old March" is likewise of no service in clarifying the god Mars.

Cleansed of these gross misunderstandings, the dossier of the agrarian Mars, as its latest advocate, H. J. Rose, has pleaded, contains four elements of proof: the ritual of the October Horse, two peasant ceremonies described by Cato, and the words of the *carmen* of the Arvales. The first of these is particularly important, and the reader must not be surprised by the breadth of the ensuing discussion.

The texts which speak of the October Horse are not numerous. They are as follows:

1. Polybius (12.4.b): "... Again, in his history of the wars against Pyrrhus, he [Timaeus] says that the Romans still keep up the memory of the fall of Troy: on a certain fixed day they kill with thrusts [or a thrust] of a javelin a war horse before the city, on what they call the Campus [the field of Mars]." Polybius then correctly rejects the explanation which connects this event with the Trojan horse, and recalls that the horse is sacrificed by nearly all of the people before the start of a war or a general battle, and that signs are sought in the manner in which the horse falls.

2. Plutarch (Q.R. 97): "Why, on the Ides of December [should be October], after a horse race, is the right-hand horse of the winning chariot consecrated and sacrificed to Mars, and why does someone cut off its tail, carry it to what is called the Regia, and there bloody the altar, while, with respect to the head, certain men, some descending from what is called the Sacra Via and others from Suburra, engage in battle?" Plutarch considers three explanations: commemoration of the Trojan horse; an affinity between Mars and the horse ("Is it because

17. J. Hubaux, *Rome et Vêies* (1958), pp. 348-67.

the horse is a spirited, bellicose, and consequently martial animal, and because what one sacrifices to the gods is principally the things which they like and which have a connection with them?"); a symbolic punishment of those who use their agility in order to flee. Finally, if the victim is a "winning" horse, "is it because Mars is the god appropriate to victory and to strength?"

3. Paulus (p. 197 L²): "A horse was sacrificed to Mars . . ." Two explanations: either it is in commemoration of the Trojan horse or because, according to common opinion, this species of animal was particularly pleasing to Mars.

4. Festus, with a résumé of Paulus (pp. 295-96 L²): "The horse which is immolated each year in the month of October on the field of Mars is called *October Equus*. This is the one which was harnessed on the righthand side of the chariot which won a race. An earnest struggle then took place, for the head of this horse, between the people of Suburra and those of the Sacra Via, the former trying to place it on the wall of the Regia, the latter the Turrus Mamilia. The tail of the same horse is carried to the Regia quickly enough so that drops of blood can fall from it onto the hearthstone, in order to make it share in the sacrifice. They say that the horse was sacrificed to Mars in his character as god of war and not, as the vulgar think, because, the Romans taking their origin from Ilion, they were revenging themselves on it, since Troy was taken by the enemy by means of a wooden horse."

5. Paulus (p. 326 L²): "The head of the horse immolated at the Ides of October on the Field of Mars was garnished with loaves, because this sacrifice was performed *ob frugum euentum*; and it was a horse which was immolated rather than an ox because the horse is appropriate to war while the ox is appropriate to the production of the fruits of the earth."¹⁸

The following very clear condensation of the arguments of the agrarian interpretation was presented by H. J. Rose at an Eitrem conference in Oslo in 1955 and published in 1958:¹⁹

18. As a discussion of words will bear on this text, here it is: *Panibus redimibant caput equi immolati Idibus Octobribus in campo Martio quia id sacrificium fiebat ob frugum euentum. Et equus potius quam bos immolabatur quod hic bello, bos frugibus pariendis est aptus.*

19. *Some Problems of Classical Religion, "Mars"* (pp. 1-17); the discussion of the *Equos October* occupies pp. 5-6 (it is reprinted here by permission of the publishers, Universitets Forlaget, Oslo). There is absolutely no reason for thinking that the horse's tail represents its penis, as H. Wagenvoort has done, "Zur magischen Bedeutung des Schwanzes," *Serta Philologica Aenipontana*, 1961, pp. 273-87. The following notes a-e are Rose's.

Even that group of festivals which fits best with his warlike qualities includes one which it is hard to explain merely as part of the cult of a waged. I mean the Equos October. It is a rite scarcely to be paralleled in Roman or other ancient cult. On Oct. 15 there was a chariot-race, apparently in the Campus Martius. When it was over, the off horse of the winning team was sacrificed to Mars; its head and tail were cut off, and the inhabitants of the Sacra Via and of Suburra fought for the former, the winners fastening it to a conspicuous building in their quarter of the city. The tail was borne by a runner to the *Regia*, where the blood was allowed to drip upon the hearth. As we know from Ovid that horse's blood was one of the materials used for purification at the Parilia,^a and that it was furnished by the Vestals, it is usually assumed that this was no other than the blood of the October Horse, handed over to them personally by the Rex. At all events, if it was not so, it is hard to see why Propertius declares^b that the purifications *curto nouantur equo*, for a beast is *curtus* if its tail is docked. The head was encircled with loaves, and we are plainly told on the authority of Verrius Flaccus, that this was done *ob frugum euentum*.^c Such testimony is not to be set aside, as has been done, because it interferes with this or that theory of Mars; if we are to understand him, or anything else connected with so complex a matter as a religion, we must take account of all the facts and not a mere selection of them, and are justified in omitting nothing save the explanations which anyone, ancient or modern, has suggested.

That something should be done in October to ensure a plentiful harvest for the coming year is perfectly intelligible, seeing that the winter wheat, which is the main crop, is sown in Italy between then and January, according to locality, and evidently the horse was a creature heavily charged with *numen* or with *mana*, according as we prefer to say it in Latin or Polynesian, since the tiny particle of his dried blood which was all any individual stock owner could be given was enough, properly used, to purify his byres, if conjoined with one or two other substances. Hence to bring the most important part of him into contact with the loaves made, presumably, from this year's wheat was to add greatly to the virtue of the whole crop-supply, present and future.

Let us therefore review the whole strange performance. Firstly a horse is chosen after he has proved himself full of vigour, for not only has the chariot to which he was harnessed won the race, but he has had the harder work of the pair, since ancient races apparently went widdershins, and therefore at the turn the off horse was urged to his fullest speed while the rear horse was

^a Ov. *F.* 4, 733, where see Frazer.

^b Prop. 4, 1, 20.

^c Fest. p. 241, 21 Linds. The whole description of the Equos October is put together from this passage, *ibid.* pp. 190, 11 ff.; cf. Plut. *Q.R.* 97 (*Moralia* 287a, b, which follows Verrius with one or two small mistakes), with my note, *Rom. Quest. of Plut.*, p. 208; Prop., *loc. cit.*; and Pol. 12, 4b.

held in. In any case, a race is a common feature in ritual the world over, for the same reason as a mock-fight, or as I interpret it, because it involves rousing oneself to full activity.

Now the beast is sacrificed, or at all events killed, for it is no ordinary sacrifice, since there is no sacrificial meal and no normal disposal of the flesh of the victim. For some reason, perhaps simply because they are the two ends, and so in a way represent the whole, a common equation in magic, the head and the tail are the important parts. We are not told what became of the rest of the carcass, nor even who was the sacrificing priest, though one would naturally assume that the *flamen Martialis* was here active in the service of his god.⁴ Now further virtue is aroused in connection with these two important parts; one is run with, the other is fought over.⁵ The concentration of *mana* could hardly be higher! As to how it was applied, we have seen that there were at least two uses, one to promote the growth of the next year's crops, the other to help purify the cattle-stalls in the spring. Incidentally, we may notice once more that the whole ritual avoids the oldest settlement: the sacrifice was in the Campus Martius, and the two contending parties came one from the Sacra Via, in other words from what had been a swamp valley when first the Palatine was inhabited, the other from the Suburra, further out still, between the Esquiline and Viminal. The tail also got no further than the Forum, and the persons concerned with its use were of that district, the Rex presumably, the Vestals certainly.

Here, then, we have nothing that definitely points to the cult of a wargod, even of a particularly bellicose deity, but a certain amount indicating some sort of connection with beasts, since a horse is killed and one of the uses of his blood is to benefit cattle. Incidentally, no one has explained why some of the blood is dripped on the hearth of the *Regia*. We may suppose that horse-magic, or horse-*mana*, was of value to the king, real or nominal, but it does not appear how he was expected to use it.

H. J. Rose is plainly right in saying that, in this domain as in every other, one must take into account all the elements and not make "a mere selection" of them according to subjective preferences. But then why pass over in silence what is specified by the most ancient document (Timaeus, in Polybius), namely, that the sacrificed horse is a war horse, ἵππον πολεμστήν, and that the manner of this sacrifice, concerning which Rose confines himself to saying,

⁴ I regard Wissowa's attempt to recover some details of the ceremonial from the completely abnormal proceedings described in Cassius 43, 24, 4, as lost labour.

⁵ For the significance of ritual combats, see my article in *Folk-lore* 36, 1925, pp. 322-331. I still think the explanation I then put forward to be at least tenable.

negatively, that it was not of the ordinary type, consists in killing the animal with a thrust (or thrusts) of a javelin, *κατακοντίζειν*?

Ob frugum euentum is translated, without discussion, "in view of the prosperous future harvest," while grammatically it may well also mean "in payment, in acknowledgment of the good conclusion of the last crop."²⁰ Diverse reasons recommend this other interpretation: (a) the ritual is part of a whole which concludes the past season, which is turned toward the past and not toward the future; (b) that which is placed on the sacrificed horse's head is not bags of seed, or even of ears of corn; it is rather the last state of the wheat, not in its natural, biological evolution, but in its utilization by human industry, and it is more satisfying to think that the offering of already baked loaves with the help of the harvested crop refers to the obtained result of a past service than to the hope of a service to come;²¹ (c) such was certainly the orientation which Verrius Flaccus gave to the rite, to judge by the commentary which Paulus sums up; moreover, this commentary, which there is no reason to reject, and which also meets the suggestions made by Polybius and the only reasonable part of the *Roman Question*, furnishes a very satisfactory explanation consistent with the double quality required of the horse: war horse, winning horse. What is this explanation?

The warfare of the Romans is not a disinterested sport. In the most ancient times, before there was any thought of dominion over Latium, then over Italy, then over the world, each year it assured the protection of the *ager Romanus* against enemy raids, and therefore the victualing of Rome. Thanks to the military campaign which comes to a religious conclusion in the military October festivals, the harvest has been able to mature, *euenire*, and the Romans have begun to make loaves out of it. Consequently, at the sacrifice on the Ides, *ob frugum*

20. A very comparable use in Tert. *Spect.* 5: *Nam et cum promiscue ludi Liberalia uocarentur, honorem Liberi patris manifeste sonabant. Libero enim a rusticis primo fiebant ob beneficium quod ei adscribunt demonstrata gratia uini*; J. Büchner translates (*Tertullianus, De spectaculis, Kommentar*, diss. Würzburg [1935], p. 66): "Sie (die Spiele) wurden nämlich dem Liber zu Ehren von den Landleuten zuerst gefeiert, wegen der Wohltat, die man ihm zuschreibt— weil er ihnen das liebliche Gut (*gratia*) des Weines zeigte." The benefit is past, the ceremony is one of thanksgiving, and comes next.

21. In another ceremony as well, animals are adorned with loaves: the asses, in the Vestalia, at the same time that the millstones are covered with flowers (Ov. *F.* 6.311–12; the asses' ears are flowered with violets, 469); it is clear that these ornaments are only marks of gratitude and honor (*seruat*, 317) for the good services of the ass and of the millstone which he turns: they do not pretend to promote future harvests.

euentum, in thanksgiving to the god who has presided over the offensive, or over the defensive, or merely over the vigilant presence of the army, the head of the winning horse is crowned with loaves, that is, with the manufactured product, already put to use, of the peacefully harvested crop. The last abridger of Verrius Flaccus specifies well this kind of benefit having an economic result but a warlike process. If it had been a matter, he says briefly, of a sacrifice offered to a god of fecundity in thanks for the generation, the physiological growth (*pariendis*) of the harvest, they would have immolated an ox, symbol of the work of the soil; but as it was a matter of acknowledging a warlike service (*bello*), which kept the enemy army or plunderers away from the fields, not to mention the evil spirits, *morbos uisus inuisosque*, as another ritual says, it is a horse, the symbol of warfare, the *πολεμιστής* of Polybius, which they sacrificed.²² Such is the simple explanation which the Romans gave themselves for the rite. Mannhardt's disciples do not have the right to substitute for this well-defined horse the phantomlike horse in which modern peasants happen to incarnate "the spirit of the wheat." No more do the primitivists have the right to blur the fixed condition for the choice of the horse—that he be a winner—in the vague notion of effort, of maximum effort, quickly translated in terms of *mana*, or rather, alas, of *numen*.

The second argument, which H. J. Rose formulates as if it were self-evident and utilizes as a proven fact, has a history, and an astonishing history. Not one of the texts cited above concerning the October Horse states or suggests that the blood from the tail of this horse was preserved in order to form, six months later, on 21 April, part of the purifying *suffimen* of the Parilia; similarly not one of the texts which tell us about the Parilia, about this *suffimen*, says anything about this origin; none of the ancient antiquaries says anything like that. It is the modern commentators on Propertius who have suggested a connection between the two festivals, not without encountering some initial resistance, but then with increasing assurance. Two texts provide some information concerning the lustral "fumigation" of the feast of Pales, that is, on the mixture which is thrown into the

22. There is no justification for keeping only the words *ob frugum euentum* of the text, while eliminating the explanation of *ob* which Paulus gives: see my discussion on this point against P. de Francisci, "Primordia ciuitatis," *RBPhH* 39 (1961): 64–65.

burning straw and purifies the livestock and the shepherds. First a passage from the *Fasti* of Ovid (4.731–34):

Ye people, go fetch materials for fumigation from the Virgin's altar. Vesta will give them; by Vesta's gift ye shall be pure. The materials for fumigation will be the blood of a horse [*sanguis equi*] and the ashes of a calf [*uitulique fauilla*]; the third thing will be the empty stalks of hard beans [*durae culmen inane fabae*].

Then a passage from the first Roman Elegy (4.1.19–20), where Propertius, contrasting the antique simplicity of the festivals with their luxury in the Rome of Augustus, writes a grammatically bold couplet, the meaning of which seems to be:

... and to celebrate each year the Parilia, they were pleased then to set fire to hay, whereas nowadays purification is made by means of a mutilated horse.

From these two little texts it has been concluded that the "mutilated horse" was the "October Horse," of which they do not say a word, and that the "horse's blood" used on 21 April, was the blood from the tail cut off on 15 October. To arrive at this conclusion, it has been necessary to make generous suppositions, since the last and only use of this tail that we know about is that a man carried it from the Field of Mars to the Regia, running fast enough so that the blood from it should not be entirely coagulated and so that the hearth of the Regia could be sprinkled with it. But is not the *aedes Vestae* very close to the *domus Regia*, and do not certain theories make of this *aedes* the ancient hearth of this *domus*? Hence a scheme of operations has been established which has become a kind of vulgate, and which is found everywhere, even in the two manuals by Wissowa and by Latte. The commentators on Propertius present the most daring formulations of this. Thus M. Rothstein: "From the Regia which belonged to the sacred zone of Vesta, or perhaps from the *aedes Vestae* itself, into which the *suffimen* may have been carried from the Regia..." Similarly the commentators on Ovid. Thus J. G. Frazer: "This blood [that of the *Equus October*] the King caught in a vessel and kept, or handed it over to the Vestal Virgins, whose house adjoined his own..." F. Bömer: "The tail of the *Equus October* sacrificed on 15 October at the *ara Martis in Campo* was carried with all haste to the

Regia, where the blood was sprinkled on the hearth, the tail itself burned, and its ashes preserved in the *Penus Vestae* until the *Parilia* (Fest. 131. 179. 180 f. 221 M. 117, 190 f. 246 L. Plut. qu. R. 97 p. 287 A; cf. Polyb. XII 4b, 11 ff. Prop. IV 1, 20).²³ This abundance of references does not prevent facts from being facts: one looks in vain in Festus, in Plutarch, in Polybius for a mention of the burned tail, or the ashes transported into the *penus Vestae* and saved for six months.

Despite its great popularity, this construction is extremely fragile. It rests on the oversimplified postulate that, since there is a question on the one hand of the blood running from an amputated horse's tail, on the other hand of the blood of a *curtus equus*, it is necessarily a question of the same blood and of the same horse. Not only is this postulate unconvincing, but it encounters grave difficulties, of which the principal ones are the following:

1. If the blood from the tail of the October Horse had had this destination, the tail would have been the essential element, and it would be astonishing that the authors who speak of this—especially the detailed and well-structured item of Festus—should not have mentioned it. Reading them without prejudice, one has the impression that the *distillatio* on the hearth of the Regia is surely the end, the sole and sufficient objective of the tail's rapid transfer, and that everything is finished, both in action and in intention, when the tail has thus rejoined (in the most favorable case) the head in the house.

2. Replaced in their context, the two verses of Propertius suggest that, in the poet's thought, the use of horse's blood for the *Parilia* is a relatively recent innovation; indeed, almost all the preceding and following distichs contrast an ancient, primitive, rough, and simple state with a modern and sumptuous one.²³ Accordingly it is hard to believe that the poet, a scholar and an archaeologist, as he is revealed by this and other elegies, could have considered the *Equus October*, in which the "king's house" plays such a prominent role, as a recent ritual, subsequent in any case to the royal period. Nor could he have meant that the sumptuary innovation consisted in the establishment of a link between two equally ancient rituals, a little clotted blood from the October sacrifice, which was practiced at all times, having been lately (*nunc*) associated with the April purification; for then

23. See now ME I: 304–36; for the festivals, see pp. 313–15 (*Parilia*), p. 316 (*Compitalia*, *Lupercalia*).

one could not see what this minor innovation would have contributed to make the Parilia more luxurious, more expensive. It seems therefore that Propertius is thinking of another horse, specially mutilated for the Parilia.

3. H. J. Rose writes, in order to establish the identity of the *curtus equus* of 21 April with the *Equus October*, "If it was not so, it is hard to see why Propertius declares that the purifications *curto nouantur equo*, for a beast is *curtus* if its tail is docked." This meaning does exist, but it is not the only one, even in the technical language of surgeons, and so much the more in poetry. Celsus uses *curtus* to designate mutilations of the ear, of the nose, of the lips, and his diction suggests that this usage is not limitative: *curta igitur in his tribus, si qua parua sunt, curari possunt* (7.9). The words of Propertius allow us to understand as well that the *sanguis equi* of which Ovid speaks is taken from an animal, which will not die as a result, by the mutilation of some projecting organ, such as the ears or the testicles, as well as the tail. As well, or better: whatever the poetic license may be, the obvious meaning of the phrase *curtus equus* is "living, surviving horse, a part of which has been cut," rather than "blood conserved from a cut part of a dead horse"—the only thing which, according to Rose's hypothesis, would be used in the Parilia.

4. What would have remained, after more than six months, of the few drops of blood which, not absorbed by the hearth of the Regia, would have been collected in *extremis* in a vase and transported to the *penus Vestae*? This third ingredient, *sanguis equi*, would not have been comparable, either in the nature of its composition or in its amount, to the two others, the apparently fresh beanstalks, and the incorruptible ashes of thirty embryonic calves burned six days earlier at the Fordicidia of 15 April. F. Bömer bypasses the difficulty by substituting for the blood the indefinitely preservable "ashes of the tail," but the expressions of Propertius and of Ovid—the latter specifying *sanguis equi* and *uituli fauilla*—do not allow this artifice; it is definitely blood as such which is required at the Parilia.

5. Finally, one must take into account the possibility that the blood of the horse's tail has not dripped at all on the royal hearth; either it coagulated too fast, or the bearer did not display the desired *uelocitas*, or fell on the way and was unable to finish the performance, etc., and therefore failed in his mission. How then will the *suffimen* of

April be constituted? It cannot depend on chance and *must* contain horse's blood.

For all these reasons²⁴ and despite so many authorities, "die philologische Kritik des Materials" forbids this springtime extension of the October Horse. Thus the argument drawn from the *suffimen* of the Parilia disappears, following the argument from the intention *ob frugum euentum*—the two mainstays of H. J. Rose's interpretation. The ritual of the Ides of October is sufficient to itself, and we must seek the means of interpretation from its features which are known to us, not in a mistranslation or in a modern invention.

The known features, which are of course only one part of this complex ritual, nevertheless allow an affirmation: the *Equus October* presents a direct homology with the Vedic sacrifice of the horse, the *āsvamedha*.²⁵

This was a sacrifice of *kṣatriya*, of the warrior class; the ritual texts

24. It has been contended that *sanguis equi*, without specification, can well be the blood of the October Horse, since *uituli fauilla*, without specification, is surely the ashes of the embryos of calves burned at the Fordicidia. The two cases are not comparable. Ovid had no reason to specify here the origin of the ashes: he had done it a few verses before, in the same fourth book of the *Fasti*, when speaking of the Fordicidia. On the contrary, he knew that he would find no other opportunity to explain the origin of the blood (according to Rose's hypothesis) before the October book, the tenth one. Therefore one may be surprised that here, in the April book, when the alleged final destiny of the blood of the October Horse was being accomplished, he did not remind the reader of what this blood was. It has been said also that it is *a priori* probable that the *sanguis equi* remained as a "residue" from a previous sacrifice, since such was the case with the *uituli fauilla*. That is misusing the symmetry and forgetting the third component of the *suffimen*, the *culmen inane fabae*, "the empty stalks of beans" (on which see below, p. 383); unless one is ready to contend that these stalks are the "residue" of the beans offered to Lemures eleven months before (on the ninth, tenth, and eleventh of May), or of the beans offered in mashed form to Carna ten months earlier (on the first of June), and that either one or the other had been entrusted, as well as the calf ashes and the horse blood, to the Vestals' care. But where can one stop in such a chain of hypotheses?

25. P.-E. Dumont, *L'āsvamedha, description du sacrifice solennel du cheval dans le culte védique d'après les textes du Yajurveda blanc* (1927) (in the appendix, fragments of treatises on the black Yajurveda); hereafter cited as Dumont. An outline of the comparison was presented in 1954 in my *RIER*, pp. 76-80. The ritual described by the treatises is of course very elaborate, but from an ancient ritual with the same meaning, which the allusions of the two hymns, RV 1.162 and 163, do not allow us to reconstruct limitatively. Celtic analogues to the *āsvamedha* have been proposed. F. R. Schröder, in *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie* 16 (1927): 310-12, and F. Le Roux, *Ogam* 15 (1963): 123-35; J. Puhvel, "Vedic *āsvamedha* and Gaulish *ūPOMiīDVOS*," *Language* 31 (1955): 353-54; and a Thracian analogy, M. Capozza, "Spartaco e il sacrificio del cavallo (Plut. *Crass.* 11.8-9)," *Critica storia* 2 (1963): 251-93. See also my paper, "L'*āsvamedha* du Colonel de Polier," *Pratidānam* (Studies presented to F.B.J. Kuiper) (1969), pp. 430-35.

repeat this affinity on many occasions.²⁶ If, in the form which the Brāhmaṇa describe, it is offered to Prajāpati, the same books still know that the great *śvamedha* of the earliest times were offered, by several princes whose names they mention, to the *kṣatriya* par excellence, Indra.²⁷ But the sacrificer and beneficiary is not just an ordinary *kṣatriya*; he is a *kṣatriya* who has received royal consecration, a king (*rājan*), a man who possesses royal power (*rāṣṭrin*), and moreover a king who has won victories and who aspires to a kind of preferment among the kings.²⁸

The victim is a horse whose outstanding speed has been proved in a race; it is the right-hand horse of the winning team.²⁹

If the king is the beneficiary, his profit is subject to risk: once chosen, the horse must be allowed to run free for the space of a year, followed only by an escort chosen from the royal household.³⁰ The escort's mission is to defend it against possible attacks by the people or the rulers of the countries through which it travels; if the latter gain the upper hand, they seize the horse, and there is no longer any question of preferment for the king who awaits it.

Once it has returned, the horse is sacrificed according to an extremely detailed ritual which exhibits a very rich symbolism, in which the horse is assimilated to the totality of what the king and, through him, his subjects can wish for. Shortly before the immolation, the body of the living horse is marked off into three sectors, anterior, median, and posterior, on which three of the king's wives (the titular queen, the favorite, and a so-called rejected wife) make the anointings provided under the patronage of the gods Vasu, Rudra, and Āditya and destined to procure for the king, differentially, spiritual energy (*tejas*, in the fore), physical strength (*indriya*, in the middle), and livestock (*paśu*, in the rear). These three advantages, distributed over the three functions, are summed up in a fourth term, prosperity or good fortune (*śrī*). Then the three queens attach golden beads, taking care that these beads do not fall, respectively, in front, to the hair of the horse's head and of its mane (or else to the two sides of

26. So Dumont, p. 201 (§584): "Le cheval est le *kṣatriya*, et les autres victimes les *vaiśya*."

27. Dumont, pp. 2-3 = *Sat. Brāhm.* 13. 5. 4. 9, 11, 15.

28. Dumont, p. 7 (§§8 and 9); variants: pp. 247 (§1), 293, 355.

29. Dumont, pp. 22-23 (§§67 and 75); "Oll. 3," *REL* 35 (1958): 130-31.

30. Dumont, p. 3 (§2); see the famous episode of Arjuna's son, Babhruvāhana, in the fourteenth book of the *Mbh.*, sections 79-81.

the mane) and, in the rear, to the hairs of its tail, meanwhile pronouncing the mystical names of Earth, Atmosphere, and Sky.³¹ This omnivalent topography of the horse's body is manifested again, with a more detailed distribution, in the ensuing ritual. Secondary victims (*paryāṅgya*), each dedicated to a god, are physically bound to different parts of the horse's body; the lists differ slightly according to the variants of the ritual, but the head and the tail have the place of honor. In all the variants studied by P.-E. Dumont, the victim or one of the victims attached to the front is destined to Agni, the fire god, while the victim attached to the tail is destined to Sūrya, the sun god; in every case, however, Indra is served at one of these two extremities.³²

Is it necessary to emphasize the ways in which these rules illuminate the known fragments of the sacrifice of the Ides of October, which truly turns out to be a Roman *aśvamedha*? We understand two aspects of the ritual: the sacrifice is offered to Mars, on the Field of Mars, and its beneficiary is the *rex*, since, in the favorable case, the two conspicuous parts of the horse's body are reunited in the Regia.

The king, however, runs a risk, before which he must remain personally passive, entrusting to his people the care of assuring to himself the possession, and hence the efficacy, of the victim. This risk differs from the Indian risk in form and movement, but they both have the same meaning: it is not before the sacrifice, or for the possession of the still living horse, that a struggle—*non levis contentio*, in the words of Festus—takes place between a "royal group" (the team from the Sacra Via, whose central edifice is the Regia) and an outside group (the team from Suburra, whose central edifice is the Turris Mamilia, otherwise unknown);³³ it is after the sacrifice, and for possession of the already severed head. The risk exists also for the tail, but in a different form: the bearer may not run fast enough to keep the blood in a liquid condition by the time he reaches the royal hearth. Therefore the king's frustration may be total. However, as in India, the result of the *contentio* and of the running, if all goes well, is to assure to the king the benefit of the sacrifice, and, if it ends badly, to deprive him of it, at least partially.

31. Dumont, pp. 152–54 (§§450–54); variants: pp. 271–72 (§§7–13), 329–30.

32. Dumont, pp. 157–58 (§§465–74); variants: pp. 267 (§12), 331, 368.

33. All that can be said is that the Mamilii were not originally Romans but Tusculans (Liv. 1.49.9): the Turris Mamilia, as opposed to the Regia, may thus symbolize the foreign element in the setting of this ritual.

There is the same difference of form and time, but the same identity of meaning in the division of the horse's body: it is not during the sacrifice and before the putting to death that the cutting off takes place, but afterward, and this cutting off is not fictive, it is real. It is performed, however, as in India, in three parts (we are ignorant only of the fate reserved for the trunk, the middle part), and the head and tail are given places of honor—probably not only, as H. J. Rose says, because they sum up the whole body, but rather because they are distributively charged with the richest symbolism.

In the best instance, both the tail and the head, in the next best only the tail, arrive at the king's house and the drops of blood from the tail are scattered on the king's hearth, *participandae rei diuinae gratia*, in order to put him into communication with the efficacy of the sacrifice. In India this service is attributed to the head which, connected by the *paryāṅga* with Agni, assures to the king, as a commentary says, "the first fire"³⁴—however one may choose to understand this, symbolism.

Only one detail of the incomplete dossier on the *Equus October* fails to correspond with Indian practice or theory: the manner of sacrifice. The horse is actually killed, in a mimicry of warfare, by a thrust (or thrusts) of a javelin, while the horse of the *āsvamedha* is smothered. Perhaps on this point the Roman ritual has been less normalized and shows itself more faithful to the spirit of the common prehistoric ritual. In any case, such a minor divergence, in which Rome carries the intent of India further than India itself does, fails to contradict the agreement which has been proved on all other points.

We see—and it is the main point of the present analysis—that this ritual of Mars is consistent with the general character of Mars, the patron of the warlike function. Moreover, it reveals important connections between the *regnum* and this function, a kind of royal capitalization on victory, at the precise moment of return from the wars.³⁵

34. Dumont, p. 157 (§466).

35. The Indian rituals insist on the total intention of the *āsvamedha*: this sacrifice is everything, and gives everything, Dumont, pp. 3–4 (§5); cf. previously RV 1.162.22 (reviewed "QII. 3," p. 80); "QII. 9 (Un parallèle védique à l'énumération d'Iguvium *nerf arsmo*, etc.)," *Lat.* 20 (1961): 257–62. One might thus imagine that the *Equus October*, while remaining the martial and royal sacrifice that it is, would have been oriented toward the demand for "everything," including the *euentus frugum* of the coming year; however, the text of Paulus Diaconus, as we have seen, does not recommend this interpretation of *ob*.

As for the method it is proper to remark that the comparison has clarified the articulation of the known details of the Roman ritual, but that this articulation has from the start been revealed by internal criticism. Following the advice which H. J. Rose gives but does not himself follow, we have taken into account all the attested facts and those facts alone, rejecting only a supplementary pseudo-fact which was invented in the seventeenth century and which has since been so often put forward that it has finally been accepted, thus throwing everything out of balance. We have also restored to its proper place and incorporated into the rebalanced whole the royal element, which Rose cited only at the end of his account, "incidentally," declaring it unexplained.

Two of the other circumstances advanced in support of the agrarian Mars describe his intervention, it is true, in a rural setting, in connection either with agriculture or with cattle-raising.³⁶ But as has been recalled above, a god is less defined by the settings in which he appears than by the kind of role he plays, by the intent and the means of action attributed to him, and it is this intent and these means which must be specified in every case. "Agrarian divinity," let us remember, is a vague expression, for there is no kinship between divinities which, like the Semones, preside over the life of the *semina* and a "savage" divinity whose only service is the preservation of the seeds, or between a fertilizing divinity who fashions the ears of corn and a watchful divinity who mounts guard at the edge of the field. Thus it is easy to verify that Mars, in the invocations which the Fratres Arvales address to him, is at the same time this savage divinity and this watchful divinity, while in the lustration of the field which Cato

To meet a strange criticism, I must stress that the concordance is in the *meaning*, not in the *precise form*, of each important feature or time in the ritual. The circumstances were too different in India and at Rome. For instance, how could the Romans let a living horse go, under armed escort, throughout the neighboring non-Roman countries? In consequence, we find the *contentio* restricted to two *vici* inside Rome, the kingly one and a neighboring one, and a stake being only the head of the killed horse. For the killing with a thrust of a javelin, see my paper "La lance de Laocoon," *Hommages à Marie Delcourt* (in press).

36. Last of all, H. J. Rose, *Some Problems* . . . (above, n. 19), pp. 9-12 (*Carmen Aruale*), 7-9 (Cat. Agr. 141). The "agrarian Mars" conception detracts from the otherwise important study by F. Castagnoli, "Il campo marzio nell'antichità," *MAL* 8th ser., 1 (1947): 93-193.

describes he is only the watchful god, in no way involved in the mysterious processes which perpetuate vegetable life.

The ambiguous character of Mars, when he breaks loose on the field of battle, accounts for the epithet *caecus* given him by the poets. At a certain stage of *furor* he abandons himself to his nature, destroying friend as well as foe, just as the youthful Horatius, still drunk with blood, slays his sister after having slain the Curiatii. Like Horatius, however, by virtue of these very qualities of *furor* and harshness, Mars is the surest bulwark of Rome against every aggressor. Likewise, in the *Ambarvalia*, the circumambulation of the boundaries of the *arua*, the cultivable lands of Rome, these two aspects of Mars are enhanced. On the one hand, since the proper season for war is at the same time decisive for the *euentus* of the crops, battles must be fought beyond the "threshold" which these boundaries constitute.³⁷ On the other hand, there are more formidable enemies to the crops than the human *hostis*—invisible, demoniac enemies—and against them a similarly supernatural sentinel is needed. This is what is demanded by the three sentences (each repeated several times) of the *carmen Aruale* in which Mars is named:³⁸

1. *neue lue(m) rue(m) sins (and: sers) incurrere in pleoris.*
2. *satur fu fere Mars limen sali sta berber.*
3. *e nos Marmor iuuato triumpe triumpe triumpe trium[pe tri]jumpe.*

If the third fragment does not in any way indicate the kind of help which it asks of Mars, the first may be translated, "Do not allow Plague and Destruction to make incursions into . . . ? . . ."; and the second, "Be thou satiated, savage Mars, jump the threshold (??), stop . . . ? . . ." The prayers of the second fragment may perhaps be understood, as H. J. Rose wishes, as follows: "Be thou satiated (not with violence, but by our offerings), leap onto the border of the field, and take up sentry duty there."³⁹ So interpreted, this fragment

37. A. Alföldi, "Ager Romanus antiquus," *Hermes* 90 (1962): 187–213.

38. E. Norden, *Aus altrömischen Priesterbüchern* (1939), pp. 109–280.

39. *Some Problems . . .*, p. 11: "Leap on the threshold (boundary? border?) and stand there." Rose commits a mistranslation with *ferae pecudes* (Lucr. 1.14), which is only an asyndeton equivalent to *ferae et pecudes*. A. Ernout, *Philologica* 1 (1946): 119–24. F. Menz, "Zum Carmen Aruale," *KZ* 70 (1951–52): 222, remarks that *ferus* does not appear as a divine epithet before Virgil, but that it may be, even in Virgil, the "reminiscence" of a cultic epithet.

would merely duplicate the first, or rather would ask the god to take up sentry duty for the service which the first fragment specifies. Nevertheless the epithet *ferē* (if this is truly the correct decipherment and reading of this word) can hardly be reduced here, in spite of Rose, to the inoffensive meaning of "not domesticated, belonging to the outside world, to the 'brushwood,'" a meaning moreover which is improper as far as Mars is concerned.

The two rhyming words in the first line *luem ruem* (again, if this is the correct reconstruction) are certainly personifications, for *incurrere* describes a concrete and voluntary action, "to make an incursion"; but it is hard to specify the exact dangers thus presented as persons. The reference is probably to something other than raids by a human enemy; *lues* at least, following classical usage, refers rather to the maladies which can inflict massive destruction on cultivated land. The demonology of the Romans is not well known,⁴⁰ but is it not reasonable to suppose that they, like so many peoples, would have attributed to evil spirits all or part of the afflictions which assail living things? It was against these spirits that Rome, through the voice of the *Fratres Arvales*, mobilized its god of battles.

The *Ambarvalia* belong to a class of lustrations which has several other varieties;⁴¹ for example, the great quinquennial lustration of the people (*lustrum conditum*) and the *amburbium* are also performed by the circumambulations of animals to be sacrificed, and it is natural that this march "on the frontier," simultaneously purificatory and preservative, should be made under the sign of the god of battles who can protect the perimeter and what it contains against every surprise. These ceremonies establish around the *ager*, the *urbs*, etc., an invisible barrier which, provided it is guarded, will be crossed neither by human enemies, whom the ramparts and the army are already prepared for, nor by malignant powers, themselves invisible, especially those which cause sickness. In several cases the victims form the group of *suouetaurilia*, which will be studied later,⁴² and which is characteristic of Mars: a boar, a ram, and a bull. But these various rituals, like the *Ambarvalia*, do not make of Mars a specialist in any-

40. Among the principal entities, with *Robigus*, note *Febris* and (Italic) *Mefitis*.

41. Outside of Rome, cf. the circumambulation of *Iguvium*, *Tlg* 1b 20-23; in India, *AV* 6.28.2 accompanies the triple circumambulation with a cow and a fire around the house (Whitney and Lanman, *HOS* 7: 300).

42. Below, pp. 237-40.

thing but “protection by force”; his whole function is on this periphery which the processions render perceptible; whatever may be the objects which he is charged with protecting, he is the sentinel who operates at the front, on the threshold, as the *carmen Aruale* probably says, and who halts the enemy. On occasion he allows specialist divinities—in the *Ambarvalia* themselves, according to the *carmen*, the *Lares*, gods of the soil, and those designated by the term *Semones*, the animate form of the inanimate *semina*; Ceres, according to Virgil (*Georg.* 1.338)—to perform a technical, creative task which varies according to circumstance. Thus it is not fortuitously that the *carmen* ends with the repeated cry of *triumpe*, which E. Norden explains well (p. 228), “Der Erfolg des Gebets, die Rettung aus Not und Gefahr, ist gesichert.”

In our discussion of the sovereign god, we have seen that Cato's peasant, when worshiping Jupiter *Dapalis*, duplicates for his own use the banquet which the magistrates offer to Jupiter *Epulo* in his temple on the Capitol.⁴³ The great gods of the archaic triad dominate public life, but they represent functions and respond to needs which likewise control the life of every subgroup, every household, every individual. It is thus natural that they should be solicited by *priuiati*. The intent of the rites is now limited to a small interest—no longer *populus* but *familia*; no longer *ager Romanus* but *fundus*; no longer *urbs* but *uilla*—and the offerings are less sumptuous; the rustic *daps* of Jupiter is reduced to a roast and a pitcher of wine. The same is true of the ritual of Mars described in chapter 141 of the same treatise by Cato: his *lustratio agri* is a lesser replica of the great rituals of circumambulation, and his *suouetaurilia* are *lactentia*, that is, they consist of a piglet, a calf, and a lamb. But the text must be cited as a whole, so that the whole may clarify certain expressions which the champions of the agrarian Mars arbitrarily isolate, and from which they draw unjustified conclusions.

After a preliminary offering of wine to Janus and Jupiter, the following model prayer is proposed by Cato, to be recited by the *uillicus*:

Mars *pater*, I beg and request thee to be benevolent and propitious toward me, our house, and our people. To which ends I have ordered the *suouetaurilia* to be led around my fields, land, and domain:

43. Above, pp. 182–83.

[First,] in order that thou may halt, repulse, and cast out the visible and invisible maladies, dearth and desolation, calamities and inclemencies (*ut tu morbos uisus inuisosque uiduertatem uastitudinemque calamitates intemperiasque prohibeas defendas auerruncesque*);

[Second,] and in order that thou may allow the products, wheat, vines, young shoots, to increase and arrive at a favorable outcome (*utique tu fruges frumenta uineta uirgultaque grandire beneque euenire siris*); that thou may keep safe shepherds and flocks and give good safety and health to me, to our house, and to our people (*pastores pecuaque salua seruassis disque bonam salutem ualeitudinem mihi domo familiaeque nostrae*). To these ends, in order to purify my fields, land, and domain, and in order to perform the purification, as I have said, be thou honored by the sacrifice of these *suouetaurilia lactentia . . .*" [The text continues with prescriptions in case the first victims should not obtain the *litatio*.]

The analysis of the services of Mars is here distributed in two lists which I have distinguished by First and Second. The first designates the *enemies* to be combated and the *methods* of combat; the second designates the *beneficiaries* and the *beneficial effects* of the combat.

The first presents Mars in his ordinary function and attitude: drawn up against the enemies, on guard or fighting. Like *luem ruem* in the *carmen Aruale*, these enemies are personifications of plagues and disasters regarded as assailants. And the action of the god is expressed by verbs of which the first two are technically military (*prohibere* "to hold at a distance, to keep from approaching"; *defendere* "to repulse in battle": the two circumstances are clearly distinguished in *Caes. B.G. 1.11.2* and 4), while the third, appropriately religious, is clarified by *Auerruncus*, probably "he who sweeps away," and well defined by *Gell. 5.12* as one of the lesser gods who must be propitiated *uti mala a nobis uel frugibus natis amoliantur*.

After this first list there is no more room for mention of *new* services and *different* actions of the god: the removal of maladies and external plagues from agriculture is the sufficient and necessary condition for the normal growth of the sown plants (a growth entrusted to the *Lares* and to the *Semones*, to *Tellus* and to *Ceres*), as well as for the health of beasts and men. The only way to protract the prayer is to enumerate the results of the divine action which has already been exhaustively detailed. The correct formulation, the precise connection of the two lists, should be as follows:

Enemies to Combat	Methods of Combat	Beneficiaries and Beneficial Effects of Combat	
VT TV:		VT (subordinate to the first VT):	
<i>morbos uisus inuisosque</i>	} <i>prohibeas</i> <i>defendas</i> <i>auerruncesque</i>	<i>fruges frumenta</i>	<i>grandiant beneque</i>
<i>uiduertatem uastitudinemque</i>		<i>uineta uirgultaque</i>	<i>eueniant,</i>
<i>calamitates intemperiasque</i>		<i>pastores pecuaque</i>	<i>salua sint,</i>
		<i>bona salus ualetudoque ~ mihi domo</i>	<i>familiaequae</i>
		<i>maneant</i>	<i>nostrae</i>

But, in praying to Mars and soliciting his interest, the peasant treats him as much as possible as an agent, and amplifies as fully as possible the intervention which he entreats. Consequently he makes Mars the subject of *all* the verbs, and makes *all* the verbs, in the second as well as the first list, transitive. By coordinating the two *ut* clauses, of which the second is logically subordinated to the first, he gives the appearance of doubling the number of the god's actions:

VT TV	VTIQVE TV (coordinated with the first VT)	
		<i>fruges frumenta</i>	<i>grandire beneque euenire</i>
		<i>uineta uirgultaque</i>	<i>SIRIS</i>
		<i>pastores pecuaque</i>	<i>salua SERVASSIS</i>
		<i>DVISque bonam salutem ~ mihi domo familiaequae nostrae</i>	
		<i>ualetudinemque</i>	

In reality the two series of verbs are not homogeneous. Those of the first list ("to keep the enemy at a distance, to repulse him, to dislodge him") express concretely, technically, and exhaustively, the god's methods of physical action; those of the second list express abstractly and rhetorically the god's psychological orientation, and the intention of the same action.

Conclusion: the second series of verbs should not be forced to signify modes of action; one must not even keep too closely to their literal meaning. Thus the first, *siris*, if one takes it literally, is inappropriate: *sinere* means only "not to prevent," which has no application in this prayer, in which Mars is evidently considered only as an ally, not as a killjoy. As for the two other verbs, it is plain that the expressions *salua seruassis* and *duis bonam salutem ualetudinemque*, applied to homogeneous categories of beneficiaries (the only difference being that the second is closer to the suppliant), are practically equivalent, the second saying no more than the first. Nevertheless,

neglecting all these considerations imposed by the context, some have tried to use the verb *duis* as proof that Mars did not confine himself to "allowing" the inhabitants of the estate to be prosperous and healthy by keeping maladies and dangers away from them, but rather that he "gave," or in other words himself directly conferred these benefits in the manner of the doctor-gods or foster gods of the third function. This is to attribute to this verb, the last of a long series, a meaning which it certainly does not have: *dare bonam salutem ualetudinemque* is only another way of saying *salua seruare*. *Dare* moreover does not necessarily have the meaning of "confer"; it may mean "to give the possibility of"; for example, *dare iter per Prouinciam* (Caes. B.G. 1.8.3) is not "to cause to pass" but "to allow to pass" through the province; it is the exact equivalent of *dare facultatem per Prouinciam itineris faciundi* (ibid. 1.7.5, in connection with the same event). So understood, *duis salutem* means merely *des facultatem salutis seruandae* "grant by thy action, in thine own order [*prohibere, defendere, auerruncare morbos*, etc.], the conditions of prosperity," and does not indicate a specific activity of the god any more than, a few lines above, does the phrase *grandire siris*. This very general word, in this final position, is not likely to sustain the heavy thesis which is placed upon it, and the prayer of the *lustratio agri* is not addressed to a Mars otherwise oriented than the Mars of the *carmen Aruale*.⁴⁴

The last argument retained by H. J. Rose in support of a third-function Mars,⁴⁵ is drawn from another rustic ritual described by Cato, chapter 83:

Votum for oxen.—Let a *uotum* for oxen be made in the following manner, *uti ualeant*. In the middle of the day, in the forest, let a vow to Mars (and) to Silvanus be made, consisting, for each head of cattle, of three pounds of wheat flour, four and one half pounds of bacon, four and one half pounds of lean meat, and three sextarii of wine. That it be permitted to put these (solid)

44. These formulas of Cato are definitely not traditional formulas, *ne varietur*, but rather models which he is proposing, and on which he has set his mark. The "trichotomies," and primarily that of the plan, which are noted in this chapter of the *De agricultura*, are consistent with what Aulus Gellius (13.25[24].13) says of Cato the orator: *item M. Cato . . . cum uellet res nimis prosperas dicere, tribus uocabulis idem sentientibus dixit*. However, triple accumulations are found in other ancient prayers (*precor ueneror ueniamque peto, metum formidinem obliuionem, fuga formidine terrore*, etc., in the *carmen* of *euocatio* of Carthage, Macr. Sat. 3.9.7-10).

45. *Some Problems . . .*, p. 7.

substances in a single container and, likewise, the wine in a single container. A slave as well as a free man shall be allowed to perform this ceremony. When the ceremony is completed, consume (the food) immediately, in the same place. Let no woman be present at the ceremony, nor see how it is performed. You will be permitted, if you wish, to repeat this *uotum* from year to year.

This description is not entirely clear, but it permits interpretation. A *uotum* is the promise of an offering in the future, on condition of receipt of a certain divine favor; having obtained the favor, the recipient is *uoti reus* and must pay his debt, *uotum soluere*. In order to fit the text to this definition, the first part must be thought of as concerning the promise and the second part the execution—whether, at the end of a year, the execution of the present promise, or the execution now of the promise of the preceding year. The last sentence supports this second interpretation.⁴⁶

Of the two divinities solicited—for despite a frequent mistranslation, the two divine names are certainly juxtaposed, not confounded, and there is no question of a “Mars Silvanus”⁴⁷—one, Silvanus, is addressed in his quality as patron of the *siluatica pastio*, the summer grazing on the wooded mountain, which was customary in antiquity. It is there, in *silua*, that the promise and the fulfillment of the vow are performed, as well as the consumption of the food. The interdiction against the presence of women at the *res diuina* likewise refers to a known characteristic of Silvanus (Wiss., p. 214).

If it were only a question of assuring the nutritive process which gives strength and health to the cattle, Silvanus, operating in his own domain, would be enough. But the *silua* has its perils, which not only surround it, as was the case for the domesticated land of the *fundus*, but penetrate and pervade it. Against these perils Mars is needed. He must stand guard not on a boundary which in any case does not exist, but on each point of the terrain where each animal walks. Whereas, in the *lustratio* of the *arua*, Mars acts “around” and the agrarian gods, Semones and Ceres, “within,” here Mars’s sector is

46. Despite Wiss., p. 410, n. 11, it does not seem that the offering of chapter 131 is the execution of the vow of chapter 83.

47. Thus H. J. Rose: Silvanus would be only a “title” of Mars. This is certainly false, see the *Commentarius* of H. Keil (1894), pp. 110–11, with the numerous examples which he cites, in this book of Cato, of enumerations by simple juxtaposition (for example, 134: *Iano Ioui Junoni prae-fato*).

coextensive with that of Silvanus—whence the close association of the two gods, which emphasizes the suggestion that all the solid offerings be placed in a single vessel, and similarly all the wine in a single container. As a consequence, with the different strategic and ritual positions which result from a different mission and setting, Mars must be interpreted here as what he is always and everywhere: the actual or virtual fighter, the sentinel ready to keep the enemy at a distance or defeat him.⁴⁸

Semones-Mars, Silvanus-Mars: this collaboration of the specialists with the fighter in agriculture and in husbandry is instructive. Like the loaves put on the neck of the *bellator equus* of the Ides of October, it reminds us, if such a reminder is necessary, that the “three functions” are created to help and to complement one another, that they can be defined only in terms of their grouping. With respect to the third this truth can be expressed in other terms. The success of the agriculturist or of the husbandman depends always on two kinds of factors—the one kind positive, concrete, special in each case, such as good grain, good soil, timely sun and rain, a fertile male, productive milch cows; the other negative and uniform, that is to say that nothing arises to upset the operation of the positive elements, that no plague, such as war, sickness, catastrophe, frost, wolves, etc., shall annul the benefits which man has patiently accumulated. Theologically this distinction defines two orders of services and refers to two types of god, of whom the second uniformly turns out to be Mars. An association with a different motive can be observed, as we have seen, between the first and the second functions. Warfare is the province of Mars through combat, through the violent means of victory, but the juridico-religious preparation, the auspices, and the whole providential background are the province of Jupiter. In all these areas he remains sovereign, as Mars, in the watches he keeps for the peasant against the enemy host and plagues, remains a champion.⁴⁹

48. Purely “medical” recipes for the oxen in Cat. Agr. 70, 71, 73, 103.

49. The dance of the Salii has often been used as an argument for the “agrarian Mars” (most recently by Lambrechts; but H. J. Rose himself has rejected it); the various ethnographic facts compared by Frazer are different: the dance of the Salii does not take place in the country but in the streets of Rome; doubtless it is a question of keeping away evil spirits at the beginning and at the end of the annual activity (R. Bloch, “Sur les danses armées des Saliens,” *Annales: Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 13 [1958]: 706–15). Arguments have also often been sought in various animals associated with Mars (in addition to the

We have several times indicated the grouping of the victims, whether adults or *lactentia*, which constitute the *suouetaurilia*, characteristic of Mars.⁵⁰ In particular, in the theory of the *spolia opima*, where the three gods of the archaic triad receive selectively the *prima*, *secunda*, and *tertia spolia*, the consecration requires a *bos mas* in the case of Jupiter; where Mars is concerned, the "*solिताurilia*" (*suouetaurilia*); and where Quirinus is concerned, a lamb. The practice is very ancient. Beyond the *trittyes* or *trittoi* of the Greeks, generally composed of the same animals as the Roman sacrifice, but with a theory and usage which present, like everything in Greece, some variety and even some fluctuation, Vedic India is acquainted with a parallel ritual, having homologous aims and a homologous recipient to those of the *suouetaurilia*. This is the sacrifice of three animals known as *sautrāmaṇi*, which means "offered to Indra *Sutrāman*, the good protector." But in India, and also among the Iranians, the canonical

wolf and the sparrow hawk, of course, Serv. *Aen.* 11.721). From the legend of the foundation of Bovianum (a Samnite *uer sacrum* led by a bull sent by Mars and finally sacrificed by him, if Mommsen, *Unteritalische Dialekte*, p. 173, is right), it has been concluded (*RL* 2, col. 2431) that there is a connection between the god and the *bos arator*, but the bull (cf. *suouetaurilia*) is something else! From the fact that the woodpecker is the bird of Mars, not only at Rome but among the Umbrians at Iguvium, at the oracle of Tiora Matiene and in the legend of the *uer sacrum* of the Picentes, an association has been assumed between Mars and agriculture: the woodpecker cries when it is going to rain; but is this really the reason for the connection between the bird and the god? In this matter one can only advance hypotheses, but this is not the only one possible: the woodpecker is a striker, and the vigorous blows of his beak are more characteristic than his cry. Cf. R. Merkelbach, "Specht-fähne und Stammesgeschichte der Picenter," *Studi in onore di U.E. Paoli* (1955), pp. 513-20; the author reviews the legends of animal leaders, which he compares with the animal ensigns of the Roman army (Plin. *N.H.* 10.16). On the ensigns, C. Renel, *Cultes militaires de Rome, les enseignes* (1903), is still valuable. According to Plin. *N.H.* 10.16 (cf. Sall. *Cat.* 59.3), Marius was the first to generalize the eagle among the *signa militaria*; before him, the eagle was only the first of five, followed by the wolf, the Minotaurus, the horse, and the boar (*aper*; *porcus*, according to Paul. *Fest.*). A. Alföldi, "Zu den römischen Reiterscheiben," *Germania* 30 (1952): 188, n. 11 (and personal communication), suggests recognizing through this perhaps hierarchical succession a list of great gods of the Republic: Jupiter, Mars, Liber Pater, Neptunus, Quirinus (for the last, see below, p. 268, n. 28, end); personally I prefer to interpret this gathering of animals in the light of the ten animal forms under which Vərəθragna, the Zoroastrian god of victory, appears: the bull, the horse, and a bird of prey, the falcon, are among them. On various aspects of the *res militaris*, see A. Alföldi, *Der frühromische Ritteradel und seine Ehrenabzeichen* (1952); G.-C. Picard, *Les trophées romains* (1957), who defends (p. 131) the "lex regia" of *Fest.* p. 302 L² against J. Carcopino (pp. 132-33, the association with the myth of Horatius seems to me less fortunate).

50. The comparison of the *suouetaurilia* and the *sautrāmaṇi* is developed in the second essay of *Tarpeia* (1947), pp. 117-58; bibliography of the Indian ceremony, p. 119, notably A. Weber, "Über den *Rājasūya*," *APAW* 2 (1893): 91-106; finally, see P.-E. Dumont, "The *Kaukili-Sautrāmaṇi* in the *Taittiriya-Brāhmaṇa*," *Proceedings of the American Philological Society* 109 (1965): 309-41.

list of sacrificial animals is composed, in decreasing order of dignity, after man and the horse, of the ox, the sheep, and the goat, the hog being excluded; meanwhile at Rome the normal victims are, besides the horse (man seems to be excluded from the national ritual), the ox, the sheep, and the swine, with only a few singular rites admitting a goat. These then are the last recognized *paśu*—goat, ram, bull—which are sacrificed to Indra.

The ritual books recognize two varieties of *sautrāmaṇi*. One is incorporated into the sacrifice at a royal consecration (*rājasūya*), the other is unrestricted. The object of the latter is fundamentally a "medication" (*Śat.Brāhm.* 1.6.3.7), a purification (*pavitra*, *ibid.* 12.8.1.8); it rids the sacrificer of every enemy that has robbed him of energy (*indriya*, *ibid.* 12.7.1.3), delivers him from all sin (*pāpmanah*, *ibid.* 12.8.16), and—a notion worthy of interest—also cures the material and mystical exhaustion to which an earlier sacrifice of soma subjected the sacrificer. After the sacrifice of soma, says the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, one feels emptied; one should celebrate the *sautrāmaṇi*, and immediately, "as a cow, after having been milked, swells anew," one recovers one's strength (*ibid.* 12.8.2.1-2). The ritual tract of Kātyāyana (19.1) anticipates five cases, notably that of a brahman who has vomited the consecrated soma, that of a king who has been dethroned, and that of a *vaiśya* who is at the same time *alampaśu* and *apaśu*, that is, capable of having cattle but not having any. The variety of *sautrāmaṇi* incorporated into the ritual of consecration should be oriented toward those interpretations which affect the kingly function, but in a preventive, not in a curative way.

Besides the regular and periodic uses in the public cult, beside the private and occasional form of the *lustratio agri*, the *suouetaurilia* are also celebrated as an expiation after fortuitous religious errors, for example, to atone for a serious accident, a violation of religious law occurring after the *deuotio*. We know that the Roman general, in order to pronounce the formula which delivers himself and the enemy army to Tellus and to the divine Manes, stands on a javelin lying on the ground. This javelin must not fall into enemy hands; if the enemy captures it, *suouetaurilia* must be offered: *si potiatur, Marti suouetaurilibus fieri* (Liv. 8.10.14). Again, under Vespasian, before the reconstruction of the burned Capitol (the ruins of the old temple having been cast into a swamp at the direction of the haruspices), the

grounds were purified *suouetaurilibus*, and it was only afterward, when the entrails were spread out on the turf, that the praetor conducting the ceremony invoked the Capitoline gods *Jouem Junonem Minervam* (Tac. Hist. 4.53). The only occasion on which it is specified that the *suouetaurilia* accompany the *lustratio* of an army before a military operation is in the account of a raid intended to establish a new Parthian king *robore legionum sociorumque* as a replacement of a fugitive king (Tac. Ann. 6.37).⁵¹ Without further comment we can see that for the liturgists of Rome as well as for those of India, the three inferior victims of the usual list, sacrificed together to the warrior god, are a powerful medicine, equally likely to prevent and to cure.

As happens almost always at Rome, only the facts are known to us, and those only schematically, but not the theory which supported them or had originally done so. On the other hand, the Indian books comment abundantly on the complete and detailed rituals which they prescribe, and often, for homologous rituals, the Indian commentaries allow us to understand the bare Roman facts as well. Such is the case here. The conceptual structure which justifies the *sautrāmaṇi* is interesting (*Śat.Brāhm.* 12.7.1.1-14). Although a sacrifice to Indra, it adds to this god of the warrior level, or rather places at his disposal so that they may lend him their strength (the etiological myth insists on this point), divinities representing the third level—Sarasvatī, the river par excellence, and the Aśvin. This means that the second and third terms of the old canonical trifunctional list Mitra-Varuṇa, Indra, Nāsatya (Aśvin) are reunited in this hierarchy, the superior term being excluded, and are completed by a life-giving goddess. This reunification culminates in Indra; everything subordinates to him.⁵² There is moreover a parallelism between the victims and the divinities, the bull going more peculiarly to Indra, who leaves the ram to Sarasvatī and the goat to the Aśvin. Thus, in the urgent circumstances in which a compromised or polluted point of the world's

51. Doubtless by allusion to the ritual mentioned below, n. 54, the *Dictionnaire étymologique* of Meillet-Ernout compares with the *suouetaurilia* (s.v.) an Indian sacrifice of a horse, an ox, and a sheep (*sic*) and adds that "in Latin" the sacrifice is performed by "rustics." This limitation is not accurate; and it is the *sautrāmaṇi*, which are also accessible to the *vaiśya* which should be cited here. On the *suouetaurilia* see D. Nony, "Recherches sur les représentations du sacrifice des s.," *Annuaire de l'Ecole pratique des hautes études*, 1966-67, sec. 4, pp. 521-26 (statement of thesis).

52. *Tarpeia*, pp. 122-31.

order must be set aright, or even when this order or this point must be protected against a foreseeable peril, a kind of strengthening mobilization of the third function occurs in the service of the god who, thus strengthened, intervenes, and intervenes alone. The *suouetaurilia* bear witness to such a mobilization, not as concerns the gods, since Mars has no associate in this ritual, but as concerns the victims. At Rome the swine are offered exclusively to the divinities of the earth's fertility (*sus plena* sacrificed to Tellus, and also to Maia, conceived as an aspect of Tellus; a sow sacrificed to Ceres at the time of the Cerialia, in express contrast to *bos*; *porca praecidaneae* offered to Tellus and to Ceres before the harvest). As for the sheep, it is, to be sure, the commonest victim at Rome, but at least in the structure of the *spolia opima*, where the *suouetaurilia* constitute the offering to the second term, Mars, the prescribed offering to the third term, Quirinus, is an *ouis*. In each case the sovereign god, Varuṇa or Jupiter, is absent, or at least is honored only in supplementary and accessory rites (for Jupiter, in Cato's *praefatio* of the *suouetaurilia lactentia*); for there are perilous circumstances in which the sovereign function gives way before the combatant function: at this point there arises in Rome the *dictator* with his *magister equitum*, and in our modern societies the head of an emergency military government.⁵³ These comparative reflections help to clarify one of the most remarkable Roman rituals and add to our knowledge of the god himself.⁵⁴

The basic unity of the function of the Roman Mars has been established: there is no reason for assuming an original agrarian aspect, which is not justified by any of the alleged clues found in the classical era. In republican times this god has remained remarkably stable, even if his social support has gone beyond the patriciate, and even if, through the evolution of the military, the human material of his activity, *milites*, has been extended to include the entire citizenry.

53. Ibid., pp. 126, 128, 154–58.

54. Another Indian ritual provides another ternary grouping, still based on the earlier Indo-Iranian list (*Tarpeia*, p. 132) of the five hierarchically ranked victims: the *aśvamedha* associates with the horse, at the moment of the sacrifice, a variety of ox and a variety of goat (Dumont, p. 156 [§464]; p. 175 [§§496, 500]). The *Avesta* recognizes mythical sacrifices, doubtless an amplification of real sacrifices, in which one hundred male horses, a thousand oxen, and ten thousand sheep are associated with Anāhitā (*Yāst* 5.21, and note by Darmesteter, *Le Zend Avesta* 2: 372) and with Drvāspā (*Yāst* 9.3). Nothing comparable has been noted at Rome on the occasion of the *Equus October*, the only circumstance in which the horse is the victim, but see below, pp. 465–69.

The identification with the Greek Ares has neither distorted nor appreciably enriched the character of the god, save in literature and art. One must wait for the worship of him affected by Julius Caesar, then for the foundation of his cult under the epithet of Avenger, in order to observe some transformations, the visible sign of which will be the establishment of Martial sanctuaries on the Capitol and in the Forum. As for the intimacy of Mars and Venus, on which Lucretius based meaningful lines in the prologue of his poem, it is no more than the intimacy of Ares and Aphrodite and will not assume importance, despite the lectisternium of 217, until the time of the Julians, the descendants of Venus.

In contrast with Jupiter, Mars stands alone. Not one divinity is associated with him. Nerio and the Moles, mentioned above, are only entities expressing two of his aspects. If the poets have given to the former some semblance of personality, she has not received any cult. At most it is generally conceded that in the accounts of spoils burned on the battlefield in honor of Mars and Minerva (Liv. 45.32.2; App. *Pun.* 133: enemy arms, machines, and vessels burned as an offering to "Ares" and "Athena"), *Minerua* is a Hellenized approximation of *Nerio*. As for the *Moles Martis*, the only trace of an actual cult dates from the time of Augustus, in a *supplicatio* commemorating the dedication of the sanctuary of Mars Ultor on the Capitol (*CIL*, X, 8375, from Cumae). Pallor and Pavor (Liv. 1.27.7) are probably not even authentic (Wiss., p. 149). Among the abstractions, *Virtus* and *Honos* do not receive sanctuaries until the end of the third century, and *Victoria* not until the beginning of the second. If the first two of these divinities, lodged in the vicinity of the temple of the Porta Capena, can pass as "martial," the third, by her ideology and by the location and the *natalis* of her temple, belongs to the circle of Jupiter Victor. Finally the ancient divinity *Bellona* has no structural connection with Mars, and her office and concept were distinct from those of the god.⁵⁵

At the conclusion of this study of the Roman Mars some consideration of the other Marses of Italy will be useful, for the champions of the agrarian Mars, repulsed from the metropolis, have sometimes

55. Below, pp. 390-92.

sought refuge and relief elsewhere in Italy.⁵⁶ What we know of these provincial cults consists of brief inscriptions, figured monuments, and passing mentions in literature; therefore the "interpreting mechanism," which readily causes such great havoc when it is no longer under the control of vast discursive dossiers, has here been given free rein. Forgetting that the great majority of documents come after the conquest and are marked with the seal of the conquerors, some have tried, on the basis of these interpretations, to reconstruct an Italic type more ancient than the Roman type, this being allegedly an "altered" one. If pressed hard, however, the scraps of information provided by these few monuments, these sporadic indications, these hundred or so inscriptions written in Latin, or in other Indo-European languages of the peninsula, or in Etruscan, are on the contrary remarkably consistent with what Rome shows. Moreover, the greater part of them serve no purpose other than to establish, here and there, the existence of a cult of Mars and the existence of his priests (*flamen* at Aricia, *Salii* in several Latin cities, *sodales* at Tuder in Umbria, among the Samnite Frentini). The most substantial of these scraps is the following. At Falerii, in the time of Hannibal, Livy mentions "that the divination tablets grew smaller and that one of them fell, revealing the inscription: Mars shakes his spear" (22.1.11). In whatever way one should understand these *sortes*, the *telum* of Mars plainly recalls the *hastae Martis* of the Regia, the shaking of which was a menacing prodigy. In several towns of Latium, in the course of these same terrible years, the accounting of prodigies mentions that *Lanuuii hastam se commouisse* (21.62.4, the spear of the warrior Juno), *hastam Martis Praeneste sua sponte promotam* (24.10.10).

At Tusculum (Latium), an officer says, on an inscription (*CIL*, 122, 49) *M. Fourio C. f. tribunos militare de praidad Maurte dedet*: if Furius gives to Mars a part of the spoils, is it not because the god has contributed to his victory? At Telesia (Samnium), a brief dedication (*CIL*, IX, 2198) is made *Marti inuicto*, where the epithet is proudly warlike, and at Interamna (Picenum), there is another to (M)*arti pacife(ro)*, where *pacifer* is certainly not "peaceable."

Some coins of southern Italy combine on their two sides a head of Mars, bearded or beardless, with a Bellona (Lucania), or else with a

56. G. Hermansen, *Studien über den italischen und den römischen Mars* (1940). What follows sums up a discussion in my *NR*, pp. 58-71.

Nike, herself crowned or crowning a trophy (Bruttium), or with a galloping horse or with a horse's head (Campania). The evident identification with the Greek Ares proves at least that the god was regarded as a warrior in all these places. Concerning the oracle of Mars through the woodpecker which Dionysius of Halicarnassus, without giving any details, reports at Tiora Matiene, in Sabine country, a reasonable association has been made with a gem representing a woodpecker perched on a column which a serpent enfolds and, in front, a warrior, while a kneeling ram awaits sacrifice.⁵⁷

One of the most interesting documents is found on a *cista*—or box, casket—discovered in 1871 at Palestrina-Praeneste, a Latin city which was early exposed to Etruscan influence. Surrounded by spectator gods, identified in provincial spelling as *Juno*, *Jouos*, *Mercuris*, *Hercle*, *Apolo*, *Leiber*, *Victoria*, *Diana*, and *Fortuna*, a central scene shows *Menerua* and Mars engaged in enigmatic behavior. Entirely naked but helmeted, his buckler on his left arm and his right hand raising a small spear, Mars kneels above a large jar apparently filled with a boiling liquid and having a mouth wider than his spread thighs. Minerva is leaning forward, holding her left hand on the small of his back, and with her right hand brings to his lips a kind of small wand. Behind the goddess her buckler and long-plumed helmet rest on a heap of stones, while a small winged Victory flies over her bowed head. Finally a seated animal, a dog or a wolf, with three heads, dominates the scene and interrupts the frieze.

This *cista* has been compared with a small group of Etruscan mirrors, on each of which several scenes are juxtaposed and on which there appears, with various qualifications, *Maris*—that is, the Italic Mars as borrowed by the Etruscans. On one of these mirrors a young man is shown, designated by the word *Leinθ*; he is seated, nude, armed with a spear, and holds on his knees a child named *Marishalna*; next we see *Menrua* bathing a young man named *Marishusrnana* in an amphora; and finally a third nude young man, unnamed, leaning on a spear. Another mirror shows first *Turms*, holding *Marisis-minθians*⁵⁸ on his knees; then *Menrua* in full armor, resting her right arm on her spear, and pulling the young *Marishusrnana* from an amphora; and finally someone named *Amatutun* carrying *Marishalna*;

57. Hermansen, pp. 96–97, 84. On all this, see further details in the appendix, pp. 677–79.

58. On this name, see "Etrusque *Maris Isminθians*," *RPh.* 28 (1954): 9–18.

beneath the central scene stands *Hercle* with his club. Still other mirrors seem to indicate that Mars, or the three young Marses, are sons of *Hercle* (Mars-hercles). G. Hermansen, who made these useful comparisons, has also cleverly recalled a text from the *Historia Varia* of Aelian (9.16): *Mares*, one reads there, the ancestor of the Ausones of Italy, lived 123 years (a figure which can be explained by the Etruscan speculations on numbers, Censor. 17.5) and had the privilege of being resuscitated twice and of living three lives. This privilege he shared with King Erulus (Herulus), whom Evander had to overthrow three times because Feronia, his mother, had given him three souls (Verg. *Aen.* 8.563).

This tradition seems to be related to the scenes on the mirrors, and one may use it, with prudence, to interpret them; however, one must bear in mind the one constant factor in these scenes: the warrior element. If the arms which Minerva bears in one of the mirror scenes, and which lie behind her on the *cista*, are not significant, because the Etruscans generously bestowed on this goddess the attributes of her *interpretatio graeca*, Athena, we must stress that the purely Italic Mars on the *cista* is likewise armed, as are the nude young men, leaning on their spears, who appear in the last of the mirror scenes. Probably we are concerned here with scenes of initiation, but of initiation into warfare and not merely into young manhood, as Hermansen suggests. The triple-headed animal in the background of the picture and the bath in the large jar or in the amphora have suggested to me, in this context, an interpretation which is without importance here.⁵⁹ In any case we do not see in these figured representations anything to support the thesis of a Mars concerned with fertility.

Nor is there any such support in the *lustratio* of Iguvium, the only ritual known in detail outside of the Roman domain.⁶⁰ *Mart-*, it is known, is the second in the triad of gods *Grabouii*; several divinities of his group are indicated by the epithet *Martio-*, and the group itself is organized, so to speak, in two stages: primarily with *Çerfo-* *Martio-*, and secondarily, across this *Çerfo-*, with *Tursa Çerfia Çerfer Martier* and with *Prestota Çerfia Çerfer Martier*—that is, “T.Ç. (and P.Ç.) of Ç.M.” *Prestota* and *Tursa* have a probable meaning: the latter is a

59. NR, pp. 65–66.

60. NR, pp. 66–70. “*QII. 8, Ombrien Tursa*,” *Lat.* 20 (1961): 253–57.

feminine "Terror" and the former a "Praestes." This term in itself is rather general, but the Romans reserved it, in their divine nomenclature, for Jupiter in association with Hercules Victor (as the supposed founder of the cult, *CIL*, XIV, 3555), and for a certain variety of Lares, the Lares *Praestites*, who, according to the excessively etymological commentary of Ovid (*F.* 5.136-37), keep watch over the city walls. In the prayer addressed to the entire group, they are asked to terrify and cause to tremble (*tursitu tremitu*), to destroy, to bind, etc., the enemy. In a prayer addressed to Prestota Çerfia Çerfer Martier alone, she is asked to ward off all evil from the community of Iguvium and to direct it onto the enemy community. Finally, another *Tursa* who has the epithet *Jovia* is requested, like the whole martial group and in conformity with her name, to terrify the enemy, make him tremble, etc. All this leaves Mars, the eponym of the whole group, in his warlike character. The duality of the *Tursa*, the "Terrors," one belonging to Mars, the other to Jupiter, no doubt refers to the two possible sources of this troublesome dilemma: it may be the logical and natural consequence of the stronger attacks of the enemy, or it may be the result of a miracle, a lowering of the morale of an already victorious army in the face of an inexplicable reversal of the situation (cf. Jupiter Stator in the Romulus legend). Under these conditions one needs a very steadfast faith in Mannhardt's teaching to try to find in Çerfus Martius, whose closest collaborators are *Tursa* and *Praestota*, a masculine equivalent to the Roman *Ceres*, and to base on this word-play an agrarian interpretation of Mars and of the whole group around him. Such an interpretation is contradicted by the context. The etymologists have no such rights, and moreover the Umbrian *-rf-* may be the result of some grouping other than **-rs-*.⁶¹

To sum up, from whatever side one views the problem, whether at Rome, or at Iguvium, or in Etruria, a strict checking of the arguments leaves Mars in his traditional role as warrior god and god of the warriors.

61. See Wiss., p. 192, n. 9; and above, p. 212; cf. below, p. 375.

5

QUIRINUS

If Quirinus poses entirely different problems for the exegete than Jupiter and Mars, it is because he was already posing them for the Romans, and because the Romans had already burdened his dossier with the kind of hypotheses with which modern scholars, our contemporaries, complicate the descriptions of the other two gods. But these ancient hypotheses are themselves interesting, since they could not have been entirely without foundation at the time they were suggested. At least in their point of departure they must reveal certain authentic traits.

The divine figure whom we have already described from the known duties of the *flamen Quirinalis*, from the feast of the Quirinalia, and from the etymology and the divine environment of Quirinus, is himself complex: from the beginnings and by his very nature, the god was probably more complex than his two superior colleagues, as complexity is an imposed character of the "third function," which is by nature more involved in concrete matters than the others. As his name points out, **Couirino-* is the patron of men considered in their organic totality. He leaves to Jupiter and Mars the ideologic superstructure, and watches over the existence, the well-being, and the continuance of this social mass. He does it prosaically, through the care which he or his flamen takes of the grain, from the eve of its maturity, through its roasting, to its placement in storage. But the very material involved in these services situates him in the vast group of divine personages, each of whom provides for a separate condition, for another aspect of this existence, this well-being, this continuance: the personification of abundance, the god of the stored grain, the goddess of flowering, the gods of the soil, the goddesses

of childbirth, and many others. While Mars stands alone, and Jupiter stands in the foreground, the pale entities on his level being far behind him, Quirinus is truly only *unus inter pares*, and may under particular circumstances be called upon to efface himself, even in the canonic statement of the triad, behind one of his numerous, better adapted peers.¹

To this at once complex and modest figure, a simple element of a whole which he represents and yet does not dominate, two accidents, occurring at a relatively early date, certainly before historical times, brought a greater degree of personality but also profound changes. To put it briefly, these accidents were his assimilation to Romulus and his association with Mars.

For the poets of the century of Augustus, Quirinus is Romulus deified after death, *genitor Quirinus*, and almost nothing else. When they make allusion—and it is not seldom—to the old triad, the third term is always understood in this way. In a scene which perhaps goes back to Ennius, the three gods whom the Hellenization of mythology has made into a grandfather, a father, and a son are reunited, with Mars asking Jupiter to fulfill an ancient promise by raising Romulus to heaven and promoting him to Quirinus. Thus Ovid (*Met.* 14.805–28, with a remarkable play on *Quirites–Quirinus*):

Tatius had fallen and now, Romulus, you were meting equal laws to both the tribes, when Mars put off his gleaming helmet and thus addressed the father of gods and men: "The time is come, O father . . ." The omnipotent Father nodded his assent; . . . Gradivus . . . mounted his chariot . . . [and], as Ilia's son was giving kindly judgment to the Quirites, he caught him up from the earth. . . . And now a fair form clothes him, worthier of the high couches of the gods, such form as has Quirinus, clad in the sacred robe [*trabea*].

In several passages of the *Fasti* the poet varies this theme: near the beginning, for example, Janus sums up in three names the simplicity of primitive Rome (1.197–202):

1. Above, pp. 171–74. On Quirinus, we have Carl Koch's confused and tendentious monograph, "Bemerkungen zum römischen Quirinskult," *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 5 (1953): 1–25 (concerning which see my remarks in *REL* 31 [1953]: 189–90); reissued in the posthumous collection *Religio* (1960) (on which see my review, *RBPhH* 39 [1961]: 1327–28); and, by the same author, the article "Quirinus" in *RE* 24 (1963), cols. 1,306–21.

Wealth is more valued now than in the years of old, when the people were poor, when Rome was new, when a small hut sufficed to lodge Quirinus, son of Mars, and the river sedge supplied a scanty bedding. Jupiter had hardly room to stand upright in his cramped shrine, and in his right hand was a thunderbolt of clay.

And again in the sixth book, 51-54, Juno, henceforth the protectress of Rome, declares:

... There is no people dearer to me: here may I be worshipped, here may I occupy the temple with my own Jupiter. Mavors [Mars] himself hath said to me, "I entrust these walls to thee. Thou shalt be mighty in the city of thy grandson." His words have been fulfilled.

This view of things could only be pleasing to the rising dynasty, whose design it served: to associate the Latin origins with the Trojan origins, Romulus with the descendants of Aeneas, that is, the Julians. Actually, in what became the commonly accepted legend of the apotheosis of the founder, the prime witness, the guarantor, he who had the first vision of the new god and whose word saved the senators suspected of assassination from the wrath of the people, bears the doubly suspect name of Proculus Julius. He swore by what was most sacred to him that while he was returning from the assembly, Romulus had appeared to him, greater and more beautiful than ever, and covered with shining armor. The founder of Rome is then supposed to have said to the ancestor of the Caesars, "It was the pleasure of the gods, O Proculus, from whom I came, that I should be with mankind only a short time, and that after founding a city destined to be the greatest on earth for empire and glory, I should dwell again in heaven. So farewell, and tell the Romans that if they practise self-restraint, and add to it valour, they will reach the utmost heights of human power. And I will be your propitious deity, Quirinus." Plutarch, who reports this philosophical counsel (*Rom.* 28.4-5), adds that the character and the oath of Proculus allowed no doubt, and that the Romans, seized with enthusiasm, abandoned their suspicions and began to invoke Quirinus.

In what era did Quirinus and Romulus encounter each other? At all events, the Alban "Proculus Julius" entered the affair at a late date. He is a witness, not so much to the apotheosis of the founder as to the pretensions of the *gens* Julia, which claimed to originate from

Alba. That is, he can scarcely antedate the beginning of the first century B.C. But we do not have the right to conclude, as is usually done, that the whole story is an invention of this period, a maneuver of the Julii. They may very well have been able to insert their ancestor here, and to name with their name the man who had been favored by the vision. There has also been abuse of the skepticism which Cicero displays concerning the transformation of Romulus into a god in *De re publica* 2.20: this skepticism bears more on the integrity of the witness than on the fact itself, of the transformation, which Cicero justifies by the exceptional virtues and merits of the personage. This attitude, we are told, proves that the identification was still recent and uncertain in the middle of the first century. Not at all: whether it was recent or ancient, it is plain that certain more or less critical minds had dissociated themselves from it. Actually there are reasons for thinking that the operation had been completed much earlier, at the very time when the legends concerning the origins of Rome received their definitive form. From this moment the two competing conceptions, Quirinus-Romulus and Sabine Quirinus, must have been proposed by the "scholars," and from here on this option must have given rise to two orientations, two politico-religious utilizations of Quirinus, neither of which could eliminate its rival or go beyond the level of probable opinion until pressure was brought by the Julii, and Quirinus-Romulus was made official. In proof of this may be given on the one hand the offerings of 296, and on the other hand the settlement at the end of the Sabine wars in 290.

I have already recalled the account of the divine interventions in the battle of Sentinum and of the offerings which prepared the way for them.² This is an important piece of evidence, because the offerings are certainly authentic and because, if the account of the battle and its miracles is no less certainly a fabrication, this fabrication followed the actual event very closely. Livy himself says that the victory of Sentinum had given rise to a double literature, uncouth epic in the songs of the soldiers (10.30.9), more highly elaborated in some amplifications (10.30.4-7). In 296 the patrician and plebeian magistrates commission works of art or of construction; the first of these honor the patrician gods, Jupiter, Mars, and "the infant founders of the city, under the dugs of the she-wolf" (*simulacra infantium*

2. Above, p. 194.

conditorum urbis sub uberibus lupae),³ while the second honor the plebeian goddess Ceres (10.23.11–13). The following year, on the field of battle, the gods give evidence of their satisfaction by various means. First a wolf, suggesting at once Mars and Romulus, raises the morale of the combatants (10.27.8–9); then Tellus, the intimate associate of Ceres, restores a critical situation by accepting the *deuotio* of the plebeian consul (10.28.12–29.7); and finally Jupiter, challenged by a vow, grants the ultimate victory to the surviving patrician consul (10.29.14–16).

The recipients, the objects or works of art, and the intentions of the aediles in 296 were certainly homogeneous. Is it conceivable, in the cases of Jupiter, Mars, and Ceres, that statues, vases, and paved roads could have been offerings, in the full meaning of the word, intended to propitiate supernatural beings, while the bronze she-wolf was only a disinterested aesthetic manifestation, without direction or intention? And so it is that the twin founders, or rather the one founder (his brother being present only for the portrayal, since the *simulacrum* was that of his *infantia*), was also regarded not only as one of the mighty dead but as a freely acting being from the other world, capable of benevolence and protective action, that is, as a god—and this is exactly how the Romans responsible for the epic accounts of the battle of the following year interpreted the action of their aediles, since the wolf which appears just before the fray is equally a sign of Mars and of the founder.⁴ Now, there was never a divine cult of Romulus, either before or after this date—the *parentatio*⁵ is an entirely

3. Two translations of this phrase have been suggested: either (Bayet), "[the patrician aediles] placed statues of the infant founders of the city under the teats of the [preexisting and until then without nurslings] statue of the She-wolf" (which would allow us to identify this she-wolf with the ancient statue in the Palazzo dei Conservatori, in Rome); or (Carcopino) "they placed a group, all at the same time, representing the She-wolf and, under her, the two infants" (which excludes the archaic statue); see the discussion in the second part of J. Carcopino, *La louve du capitol* (1925), pp. 20–53. This debate is important for the archaeologist, much less so for the historian of religion, unless one follows Carcopino in the speculations of the third part of his essay. The patrician offerings are, respectively: (1) a gate of bronze for the Capitol, silver vessels for the three tables placed in the cella of Jupiter, and the statue of Jupiter himself, along with the quadriga placed on the top of the temple; (2) near the *figus Ruminalis*, statues of the infant founders under the teats of the she-wolf; (3) the pavement with square stones of the avenue which leads from the Porta Capena to the temple of Mars. The plebeian offerings are, in addition to games, golden *paterae* deposited in the temple of Ceres.

4. Cf. the assembling of the two brothers, Mars, and Jupiter in the verses of M. Manilius, *Astronomica* 4.26–29.

5. H. Wagenvoort, "The *parentatio* in Honour of Romulus," *Studies in Roman Literature, Culture and Religion* (1956), pp. 290–97.

different matter—except in terms of his assimilation to Quirinus: this is a good reason for seeing the first evidence of his assimilation in the offerings of 296. A second reason is added to this: the placing of Jupiter and Mars in a triad with another divine personage suggests that this term was already equivalent to Quirinus, that it had been set (and thus, theologically, could be set) in Quirinus's place in order to form a modernized variant of the archaic triad. This can best be explained if Romulus was Quirinus.

But, during this difficult period, Quirinus is not only Romulus. Two years after Sentinum, in 293, a temple is dedicated to him by L. Papirius Cursor, probably in fulfillment of a vow made by his father the dictator (Liv. 10.46.7). And soon the Sabine Quirinus makes his appearance. Recall the historical events which seem, as Mommsen has suggested, to have provided the account of the war and the fusion of the Romans of Romulus and the Sabines of Titus Tatius with substance and ethnic names.⁶ In 290, after an easy campaign, Rome annexed all the Sabine peoples and immediately conferred upon them the right of citizenship *sine suffragio*, waiting twenty-two years before giving them full equality, and then incorporating them—which must be significant—into the newly constituted *Quirina* tribe. Thus it is probable that the two “historical” interpretations of Quirinus, whether as the deified Romulus or as a god brought to Rome by the Sabines after the fusion of the two peoples, are contemporaneous, and that hesitation between the two, preventing either one or the other from receiving full acceptance, is just as old as their formation itself.

But nothing is made from nothing. If the god Quirinus, in one of the variants, was attributed to Titus Tatius, it was because of a pun on the name of the city of Cures, and at the same time because Tatius, along with his Sabines, had assumed in the legend the role of “component of the third function” (rural riches, fecundity, and mass), the very things that Quirinus represented. In the other variant, what reason could have favored or stimulated the interpretation of the god as a hero?

Apotheosis, the promotion of a great man to the rank of the gods, is a Greek affair, and it is admitted that the transmutation of Romulus into Quirinus was possible only after a certain degree of penetration of Roman ideology by Greek conceptions. So be it. But it is not by

6. Above, pp. 5-7.

chance that this phenomenon singled out Quirinus rather than any other god. In India and in Scandinavia, the Indo-European gods of the third function are distinguished from those of the higher functions by the fact that they willingly live like men, and among men. Think of the Nerthus of Tacitus (the goddess homonymous with Njörðr, one of the two typical Vanir in Norse mythology), and of her yearly promenade through the nations of her worshippers (Tac. G. 40.3-4); think of the Freyr of Uppsala who was similarly paraded from village to village, along with his wife the priestess, and was honored with banquets.⁷ In India, think of the reproach with which Indra justifies his initial refusal to admit the Aśvin to the privilege of the sacrifice: "They are not true gods," he says; "they have constantly mingled with men, and they live like men."⁸ One may also believe that the god *Cuirino- was by nature close to men, and that the status combining god and man which legend imposed upon him would have been inconceivable for Mars as well as for Jupiter.

On the other hand, since the accounts of the earliest period of Rome are in large part humanized and historicized mythology, it must not be forgotten that Romulus, like a number of other personages in those accounts, may play a role which, among other Indo-European peoples of a more speculative nature, is attributed to one or to several gods. Until the foundation of Rome, when his character changes by becoming kingly, Romulus presents one dominant trait: he is a twin, inseparable from his brother; and both live as shepherds. How can we not be reminded of the Vedic and pre-Vedic theologem concerning the gods of the third function, which recognizes in the pairing of the Nāsatya or Aśvin, the twin gods, a significance sufficiently representative for the canonical list of the gods of the three functions to be "Mitra-Varuṇa, Indra, and the two Nāsatya"? One realizes the importance of the concept of twinship on the level of abundance, vitality, and fecundity. By common agreement among a great number of peoples, the birth of twins is the sign and token of all these things. It was so among the Indo-Iranians. Thanks to this reserve of vital power to which their duality bears witness, the two Nāsatya-Aśvin, who are practically indistinguishable in the Vedic hymns and rituals, distribute their benefits throughout a large number of the provinces

7. The episode of Gunnar Helmingr, *Flateyjarbók* (ed. 1860) I: 337-38.

8. Dumézil, *NA*, pp. 161-62; *Mbh.* 3: 10.379-82.

of the third function. They rejuvenate the elderly, heal sick men and animals, restore the mutilated, join lovers together, enrich, save from dangers and persecutions, provide miraculous cows and horses, cause milk and hydromel to gush forth, etc.

While at Rome the twins fell from mythology into history, in other Latin cities they seem to have preserved a more exalted position, at least intermediate between divinity and humanity. At Praeneste the legend of the founder Caeculus⁹ recalls in certain respects that of the founder Romulus, but the pair of brothers, either twins or equivalent to twins, is set in another generation: they are his uncles. It was related that before the foundation of the city two shepherd brothers, the Depidii (or Digidii), lived in the region with their sister. One day while the latter was sitting near the hearth, a spark fell into her bosom and impregnated her. She exposed the newborn child near a spring, where he was found by young girls—whom a variant also calls *sorores Digidiorum*—coming in search of water. They carried the child to the Depidii brothers, his uncles, who brought him up. After spending his youth among the shepherds, he formed a band of boys of his own age and founded Praeneste (Ser. *Aen.* 7.678; *Schol. Veron. in Verg. Aen.* 7.681; Solin. 2.9). If we are not expressly told that the Depidii are twins, their number and their indissociability suggest that we regard them as such. Furthermore, they are “divine”: *erant etiam illic duo fratres*, says Virgil’s commentator, *qui diui appellabantur*. Thus we may conceive that the primitive mythology of the Latin peoples was familiar with a pair of shepherd brothers, probably twins and gods, but living among men, whom the “histories” of the origins of the various cities have variously used—in other words, a type homologous to that of the Vedic Nāsatya. If at Rome the idea of a “demigod” seems to show Greek influence, the less specific idea of *diui*, at Praeneste, may preserve a genuine Latin conception.

This view is confirmed by the numerous points of agreement which can be seen between the legend of the childhood of Romulus and Remus and the characteristics or services attributed to the twin gods in the *R̥gVeda*.¹⁰

As we have just recalled, the Nāsatya are at first challenged by the

9. Above, pp. 55–56, and below, pp. 324–26.

10. References to the characters or activities of the Nāsatya will be found in the handbooks of Vedic religion, for example in A. A. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology* (1897), which remains one of the best and least theoretical.

other gods because they have "mingled with men," and in the later literature they will sometimes be regarded and classified as the gods not even of men of the third function, but of the *śūdra*, the very lowest level, even outside organized society. This is how Romulus and his brother live. They are strangers to the established order; devoted to the lowliest class, they treat with contempt the king's people, chiefs, and inspectors of flocks (Plut. *Rom.* 6.7). The band which helps them in their revolt is composed of shepherds (Liv. 1.5.7), or is even a collection of paupers and slaves (Plut. *Rom.* 7.2), prefiguring the classless settlement of the Asylum (ibid. 9.5).

As the Nāsātya spend their time in redeeming the injustices of fate and the misdeeds of men, so Romulus and Remus are the redressers of wrongs. Being men and not gods, they cannot perform miracles, as the Vedic twins do, but they use every human means to protect their friends against brigands, and the shepherds of the good Numitor against those of the wicked Amulius (Plut. *Rom.* 6.8).

One of the earliest and best-known services of the Nāsātya consisted of their taking the aged Cyavana out of his decrepitude and opening up for him a new career as a man.¹¹ The first great exploit of Romulus and Remus was the restoration of their grandfather, who had been bullied and robbed of his kingdom by Amulius.

Between the two Nāsātya, who are generally indistinguishable, a Vedic text establishes an inequality which corresponds to that between the Greek Dioscuri: one of them is the son of Heaven, the other apparently the son of a man. The inequality of the Roman twins is of another sort, but it is also considerable: though they are equal in birth, one of them will perish and will receive only those honors to which the great dead are entitled, while the other will found Rome, reign over it, and become Quirinus.¹²

One of the services required of the Nāsātya is that they put an end to sterility in women and animals. Romulus and Remus are the leaders of the two groups of Luperci, one of whose annual services is to bring motherhood, through flagellation, to the women of Rome (an etiological legend, which places the origin of this rite after the

11. NA, pp. 158-70; completed by J. de Menasce, "Une légende indo-iranienne dans l'angéologie judéo-musulmane: à propos de Hārūt-Mārūt," *Études asiatiques (Revue de la Société Suisse d'Études Asiatiques)* 1 (1947): 10-18; cf. H. C. Puech, *RHR* 133 (1947-48): 221-25.

12. R. Schilling, "Romulus l'élú et Remus le réprouvé," *REL* 38 (1960): 182-99.

foundation of Rome and the rape of the Sabine women, says that it was invented to put an end to a general sterility).

Throughout the *R̥gVeda* the wolf is an evil creature, whose very name symbolically designates whatever is hostile and foreign. The only exception concerns the Nāsatya: at the prayer of a she-wolf they restore sight to a young man who had killed his father's rams in order to feed her, and whose eyes the father had pierced in punishment. The role of the "friendly" she-wolf in the legend of the Roman twins is well known.

One of the most famous miracles of the Nāsatya consisted in their allowing a mythical hero to survive in a furnace into which he had been thrown, and even making this bath of fire pleasant for him. One of the variants concerning the birth of Romulus and Remus has them born from the fire on the hearth, and at Praeneste Caeculus, the nephew of the two *diui fratres*, is similarly born, and later proves his mastery over fire by kindling and then extinguishing a blaze at will.

This parallelism confirms the antiquity of the motif of the "twin" heroes or gods, and its existence in the third function. To whatever era we may trace the formal assimilation of Quirinus to the most prestigious of the twins, the affinities which allowed this assimilation were inherent in the nature and the rank of the personages involved.

If we were better informed about the ancient functioning of the *curiae*, about the status of the *curiones* and especially of the *Curio maximus*, perhaps other affinities would appear between the founder to whom this curiate organization of the people of the Quirities is attributed, and the god who bears it in his name. It is remarkable that the other variant, the one which makes Quirinus a preexisting god brought in by the "component of the third function," the Sabines, accounts for the curiate organization on the basis of this component. It was supposed that each of the thirty *curiae*, despite the obviously local significance of several of them, had received the name of one of the young Sabine women whose rape had provoked the war and whose intervention had established the unitary society.

The assimilation to Romulus had very considerable consequences, and contributed not a little toward breaking the internal coherence of the character of Quirinus. The legend of Romulus is long and complex,

and presents him successively under several aspects—at least three. During his childhood and until the restoration of his grandfather and his departure from Alba, he is, in association with his twin, the shepherd, proud and noble to be sure, but still the shepherd. Then, with Remus eliminated after the foundation of the city, Romulus becomes a man of war: from the rape of the young women until the fusion of the two races, his history is that of his struggle against the allies of the Sabines, then against the Sabines themselves, and in this phase, the variant involving three races (Latins, Etruscans, and Sabines) associates him with the Etruscan technician in war, Lucumon. Finally, after the synoecism, at first in an almost consular collegiality with the Sabine Tatius, then alone, and in an evolution inspired by the Greek tyrants, he demonstrates a type of kingship—in which several wars are only secondary elements—a type which his successor, Numa, will complement by demonstrating a precise counterpart. These three Romuluses, however, are in fact only one; once assimilated to Romulus I by virtue of the expediences which have been listed above, Quirinus found himself naturally assimilated at the same time to Romulus II and Romulus III. This is the fate of all the *interpretationes*. Toward the end of the Republic, when the Romans, for the sake of a common ritual detail and perhaps for the sake of the idea of “whiteness,” had interpreted their Dawn goddess, Mater Matuta, as Leucothea, the entire legend of the latter was transferred to the former, and since Leucothea was the mother of Melicertes-Palaemon, Matuta found herself entrusted with the unexpected role of mother of Portunus, who was himself assimilated to Melicertes for the sake of the connection which each of them had with water (Ov. *F.* 6.545–46). One of the reasons for the difficulty in getting a clear view of the Gallo-Roman divinities stems from the fact that a number of them are called “Mars,” or “Mercury,” or “Apollo,” by virtue of fragmentary and variable analogies with these Roman gods, while in essential points these various Marses, Mercurys, and Apollos were extremely different. Sometimes we can grasp the perplexities which this kind of problem cannot fail to cause for conscientious theoreticians. At the beginning of the thirteenth century the scholar Saxo Grammaticus wonders at length how he can make the Othinus and Thor of Scandinavian mythology correspond to Jupiter and Mars. Jupiter is the god who hurls the thunderbolt, like Thor, but he is also the king of the

gods, like Othinus; on the other hand, this king of the gods is the god of war, like Mars . . . In antiquity, however, these scruples were in general quickly set aside: once based on a partial correspondence, identification unrolled its consequences, resulting in an unending chain of corrections and innovations in the characteristics of the god concerned. This is certainly what happened when Romulus became Quirinus. He became in the legend the son of Mars, which was of no consequence so long as it remained literary; but he also was given the warrior's uniform as Romulus II, which was contradictory to his nature. Here a second factor becomes involved.

In Vedic India as well as in Scandinavia, the divinities of the third function, the Ásvin as well as the Vanic gods, Njörðr and Freyr, act peacefully. Of the numerous services which the hymns to the Ásvin obligingly list, not one is warlike; if they happen to appear in a battle, it is not to fight, but to pull a threatened combatant out of danger.¹³ But even this is exceptional, and the verb *kṣi-*, "to inhabit peacefully," recurs frequently in the prayers which characterize them and their level. The *Ynglingasaga* which humanized as kings the principal Norse gods and transposed their theology into royal activities, after describing the magical powers and warlike talents of "king" Óðinn, comes to Njörðr, and says (chap. 9):

In his time there was a marvelous peace [*fríðr allgóðr*] and so many harvests of all sorts that the Swedes believed that Njörðr had power over harvests and the property of men.

And this is certainly a fundamental trait. More than a thousand years earlier, Tacitus had noted the exceptional peace which was respected during the days when Nerthus, the feminine homonym of Njörðr, circulated from village to village, drawn in her chariot by cows (G. 40.3-4):

These are days of joy, the places which she honors with her visit and whose hospitality she accepts are festive. Wars are not begun, arms are not taken up, every iron object is locked away. It is the only period of time when peace and tranquillity are known and enjoyed . . .

Njörðr's son and successor, Freyr, the second king of the same type, gave his name to a peace celebrated in legend (*Ynglingasaga* 10):

13. "Les trois fonctions dans le *ṚgVeda* et les dieux indiens de Mitani," *BAB*, 5th ser., 47 (1961): 275, n. 1 (against P. Thieme).

... He was greatly beloved and blessed by good seasons like his father. Freyr erected a great temple at Uppsala and made his chief residence there, directing to it all tribute due to him, both lands and chattels. This was the origin of the Uppsala riches, which have been kept up ever since. In his time began the so-called "Peace of Froði" [another of his names]. There were good harvests at that time in all provinces. The Swedes attributed that to Freyr. And he was worshipped more than other gods because in his days, owing to peace and good harvests, the farmers became better off than before.

This dream of a peace which will bring tranquillity and wealth, this observance of *laeti dies* when arms will be at rest—were they connected with the third term of the Roman triad as they were with the third terms of the Vedic and Scandinavian triads, and as the logic of its function would require? The poets of the century of Augustus answer affirmatively, and it is even a theme of propaganda. After the warlike Caesar, Augustus brings peace, a "Quirinal" peace. At the beginning of the *Aeneid* (1.286–96), the revelation of the future grandeur of Rome, supported by a faultless theological doctrine, which Jupiter makes to Venus, is completed by this diptych:

From this noble line shall be born the Trojan Caesar, who shall limit his empire with ocean, his glory with the stars, a Julius, name descended from great Iulus! Him, in days to come, shalt thou, anxious no more, welcome to heaven, laden with Eastern spoils; he, too, shall be invoked in vows. Then shall wars cease and the rough ages soften; hoary Faith and Vesta, Quirinus with his brother Remus, shall give laws. The gates of war, grim with iron and close-fitting bars, shall be closed; within, impious Furor, sitting on savage arms, his hands fast bound behind with a hundred brazen knots, shall roar in the ghastliness of blood-stained lips.

Since antiquity there has been discussion concerning the precise meaning which should be given to the unexpected mention of Quirinus, in the hemistich *Remo cum fratre Quirinus*. Does it mean the reuniting of Roman with Roman, all factions forgotten? Or can it possibly refer to Augustus and some close collaborator, such as Agrippa? In any case, Quirinus cannot possibly be an empty word in this context, where almost all the others allude to known manifestations of the prince's politics (*saecula*; the Secular Games; *Vesta*: the new cult established on the Palatine, *Vesta Caesarea*, as Ovid says; *Belii portae*: the closing of the temple of Janus).¹⁴

14. Above, p. 202.

The festival of Robigus on 25 April, at which the flamen of Quirinus officiates, provides the author of the *Fasti* with a good occasion for developing the same theme (4.911–32).¹⁵ In the spirit of the reign, Ovid composes the prayer which the priest is supposed to address to the wicked goblin personifying wheat rust: Let him keep his rough hands off the ears of wheat! If he absolutely has to attack something, let it not be the frail crops, but rather hard metal! Let him first destroy that which is destined for destruction anyhow, the swords, the harmful javelins! There is no need for them any more: let the world enjoy its tranquillity!

It is generally admitted that this exaltation of peace under the name of Quirinus is a recent development. It is supposedly a prolongation of the contrast between *Quirites* and *milites*, which is itself considered to be of late origin. Four reasons argue against this hypothesis. First of all, let us repeat that peace is to be expected in the group of coherent concepts which constitute the function of the earliest Quirinus. Then, it would be strange if this innovation had occurred in a time when Quirinus, through his assimilation to Romulus, had reasons for becoming warlike, if he was not already so, or of developing this aspect, if he already possessed it. On the other hand, though certain ancient scholars were well aware of the etymological connection of *Quirinus* with *Quirites*,¹⁶ there was not enough solidarity between these two concepts, at least in the final centuries, for the evolution of one automatically to entail the evolution of the other. Finally, it is not certain that the *Quirites-milites* opposition is so recent. To be sure, it is illustrated by Caesar's famous apostrophe to his weary soldiers. It was enough for him to call them by the scornful name of *Quirites* to make them return repentantly to their duty, to their character of *milites* (Suet. *Caes.* 70; etc.).¹⁷ But it is not true, as Wissowa believes, that the opposition is found only here and in a fine verse of the late poet Claudian. Livy in particular uses it as a matter of course throughout 45.37–38 as the equivalent to another opposition, *exercitus-plebs*. And above all we have a partially formulaary attestation of it which Jean Bayet¹⁸ has brought to light. Varro (*L.L.* 6.88) copies this formula,

15. Above, p. 158.

16. Thus Varro *L.L.* 5.73: *Quirinus a Quiritibus*.

17. See also the facts cited in *JMQ* 4: 162, n. 5.

18. Tite-Live, Budé edition, 3 (1942): 122, n. 4. A connected problem in J. J. Morel, "Pube praesenti in contione, omni populo (Pseudolus, v. 126), *pubes* et *contio* d'après Plaute et Tite-Live," *REL* 42 (1964): 375–88.

which he claims to have found in the *Commentarii Consulares*, a kind of ceremonial guide for the consuls:

He who is about to summon the citizen-army, shall say to his assistant, "Gaius Calpurnius, call all the citizens [*Quirites*] hither to me, with an *inlicium* 'invitation.'" The assistant speaks thus: "All citizens, come ye hither to the judges, to an invitation meeting." "Gaius Calpurnius," says the consul, "call all the citizens hither to me, to a gathering." The assistant speaks thus: "All citizens, come hither to the judges, to a gathering." Then the consul makes declaration to the army [*ad exercitum*]: "I order you to go by the proper way to the centuriate assembly" [or: "to form yourselves into centuries"].

Unfortunately Varro did not copy the rest of the formulary, but what he cites is sufficient. We see here with what care the consul, called *iudex*, before taking over his command (*imperaturus*), designates the still strictly civilian men whom he has brought together by the name of *Quirites*. Once the command has been assumed, and the consul expresses himself directly, without the intermediacy of the herald (*impero*), this term does not occur any more, and the men who receive his order are simply the *exercitus*.

The differential civilian meaning of *Quirites*,¹⁹ when Caesar used it so opportunely, was thus an ancient and probably fundamental one. If *curia*, *Quirites*, *Quirinus*, three words having the same origin, underwent independent development, nevertheless all three in various ways exhibit this shade of meaning: in the first two, civilian as opposed to military; in the third, peace as opposed to war.

In the case of *curia*,²⁰ this nuance emerges from the very definition of the *comitia curiata* (convoked *curiatim* at the call of the lictor), as opposed to the *comitia centuriata* (convoked at the sound of the trumpet) (Gell. 15.27). The former are those in which voting is done by families (or clans), *ex generibus*, that is, in the natural framework of social life, while the latter are those in which one votes by classes of property and age, *ex censu et aetate*, that is, in the framework of mobilization. As a result, it is *nefas* for the *comitia centuriata*, but not for the

19. The *bellicosus Quiritibus* of Hor. *Carm.* 3.3.37 owes its rhetorical effect into the association of two terms which, ordinarily, are mutually exclusive.

20. At least in primitive times.

curiata, to be assembled inside the *pomerium*, *quia exercitum extra urbem imperari oporteat, intra urbem imperari ius non sit*.

The matter is complicated by the fact that those who form, respectively, the *curiae* and the *centuriae*, as well as those who are called *Quirites* and those who are *milites*, during the eras when we can observe them, are the same men. Speaking above of Mars, we recalled that Rome does not have classes of men who specialize in war, who are uniquely and consistently warriors, whether by vocation or initiation. Such groups are still encountered among the Samnites at the beginning of the third century, and they occur among the Indians under the name of *márya*. When did they disappear from Rome? It is impossible to determine, since throughout the history of the monarchy the annalists portray the legionary form of the army. In this form, the only one available to us, every Roman male between two fixed ages is alternately civilian and soldier, citizen and combatant, depending upon the circumstances. Put in other terms, it is not a question of exclusive functional classes such as the *kṣatriya* and the *vaiśya* of India, the *jarlar* and *karlar* of the Eddaic *Rígspula*, and the Irish *flaith* (the Gaulish *equites*) and the peasant mass of the *bó airig*. It is a question of two types of activity (of ethics, law, affinities, etc.) succeeding each other cyclically in the life of the adult. Each man, patrician or plebeian, passes from his fields to his century, then lays down his arms to take up the plow again or to supervise it. In a word, he is the soldier-laborer of whom Cincinnatus remains the most famous example.

This alternation, which was seasonal for many generations, before its periods were changed and unbalanced, also influences the concept of the "peaceful Quirinus." He is not the patron, if indeed he ever was, of a social class exempt from military service as opposed to another uniquely warlike group, even in times of peace. Rome no longer has any such class, and probably never did. Quirinus patronizes merely one of the two modes of behavior which each Roman assumes in turn, and which makes him, according to one's point of view, either a civilian between two calls to duty or a soldier between two leaves. In this way we can explain the definition for which Virgil's commentator has provided two variants. Explaining the *Remo cum fratre Quirinus* of the first book of the *Aeneid* (292), Servius writes:

"When Mars breaks into rage [*cum saeuit*], he is called Gradivus; when he is tranquil [*cum tranquillus est*],²¹ Quirinus. He has two temples in Rome: one, the temple of Quirinus, inside the city, in his character as peaceful guardian [*quasi custodis et tranquill*]; the other on the Appian Way, outside the city, near the gate, in his character as warrior [*quasi bellatoris*], or Gradivus." Then, in the sixth book, coming across Quirinus again on the occasion of the third *spolia opima* (860), he writes once more: "Quirinus is the Mars who presides over peace [*qui praeest paci*] and is worshiped inside the city, for the Mars of war [*belli Mars*] had his temple outside the city."

These formulas have seemed so strange to many exegetes that, following a usual procedure, they have declared them to be meaningless. On the contrary, they describe very well, on the level of the gods, the actual conditions of life on the human level. Just as *milites* and *Quirites* are contrasting and alternating aspects of the same men, so Quirinus and Mars administer the same social matters, by dividing war and peace: a violent but limited war, a calm but vigilant peace; a war of citizens, a peace of reservists.

This idea of vigilance in tranquillity (*quasi custodis et tranquill*) which supports the assimilation of Quirinus to Mars was at all times familiar to the Romans. At the time of the last, unfortunately civil, war in which he took part, Cicero sets forth its theory in beautiful formulas (*Philip.* 2.113): "The name of peace is sweet, and its reality is happy; but what a difference between peace and slavery! Peace is liberty in tranquillity [*pax est tranquilla libertas*], while slavery is the worst of evils and must be rejected not only at the price of war, but at the price of death." Since the days of the still quasi-mythical war in which the newborn *libertas* had forced Porsenna's respect, had not Rome consistently conformed to this rule, against the external enemy?

A rite, probably annual, which we should like to know better but

21. It is doubtful that the Romans of the classical period noticed the etymological connection between *tranquillus* and *quies*. At any rate, nobody explained *Quirinus* by the root of *quies*, or compared the two words; in his gloss Servius obviously makes no "etymologisches Spiel" between the *qui-* of *Quirinus* and the *-qui-* of *tranquillus*. This hypothesis vitiates W. Burkert's discussion in a note in his article, "Caesar und Romulus-Quirinus," *Historia* 11 (1962): 360, n. 27, which is otherwise filled with good things; in the same discussion, the author does not observe the difference in treatment, and thus in meaning, of the "arms of Mars" and the "arms of Quirinus" (below, n. 23); for Quirinus-Enyalios, below, p. 263.

whose meaning is clear and which it would be hypercritical to suspect, expressed this vigilance in a sensible way; we know it incidentally through a gloss in which Festus and his abridger explain the name of a vase which is used in it: the name *persillum* was applied to a *rudiculum* covered with pitch, in which was kept the ointment with which the *flamen Portunalis* smeared the arms of Quirinus (Fest. and Paul. p. 231 L²). In practice, to rub arms with a greasy object means that one is not counting on using them immediately, but that one wishes to keep them in good condition for later use. This fits the idea of "Mars tranquillus" exactly. And since it seems likely that Portunus was the god of gates,²² the intervention of his flamen is plausible. If the temple of *Mars belli* is outside the walls, a short distance in front of the Porta Capena, that of *Mars qui praeest paci* is *intra urbem*, in the projection made by the wall of Servius as it follows the curve of the Quirinal, quite close to two gates, the Sanqualis and the Salutaris, and not far from the Collina or Quirinalis; regarding the latter, Festus cannot make up his mind to explain its name in terms of the hill or of the sanctuary (*sive quod proxime eam sacellum est Quirini*, p. 361 L²). The inverse position of these two places of worship in relation to the gates, which are the conspicuous points of the enclosure, make clear the interest of the Gatekeeper in the good condition of stored arms, as symbolized by those of the Guardian of the Peace. How could Portunus, who was portrayed with a key in his hand (Paul. p. 161 L²), and Quirinus, who was defined as *custos et tranquillus*, not have collaborated?²³

Such are the two ways in which Quirinus was associated with the warlike function: the weight of the Romulus type, to which other considerations had caused him to be assimilated; and the form taken at a very early date by the Roman *res militaris*, which made every civilian a man of Mars, in a state of deferment.

If the second way did not end in total militarization, it contributed nonetheless to the *interpretatio graeca* which was established at the time of Polybius and was never effaced: *Ἐνυάλιος*. This very ancient warrior god, whose name, in recent times, was one of the first to be

22. Schol. Veron. Aen. 5.241, *deus portuum portarumque praeses*.

23. Latte's refusal, p. 37, n. 1, to admit that it is a question of the *flamen Portunalis* is *a priori*: this author does not understand that on the level of Quirinus the divinities must collaborate. As for the idea itself of *arma Quirini*, cf. "Remarques sur les armes des dieux de troisième fonction chez divers peuples indo-européens," *SMSR* 28 (1957): 1-10.

deciphered on the tablets written in Mycenaean Linear B, was very early assimilated to Ares, to the extent that in the *Iliad* he is only a name or a surname of the great god of battles. It was probably this subordinate nature which suggested that his name be used to express Quirinus. Between Quirinus and Mars the transposers probably retained the limited identification to which in later times the happy formulas of Servius bear witness, and they must have searched for a Greek god who was himself confused to a greater or lesser degree with Ares; and so Enyalios must have been the perfect solution. But every interpretation is deceptive and misleading. The connection between Enyalios and Mars is in no way based on the alternation of suspended warfare and unleashed warfare, but solely upon the latter, of which they are both promoters. This distinction, which was certainly the essential one, was then blurred with regard to the Roman god, and at least in the minds of the Greek authors, the designation of Enyalios made Quirinus a *πολεμιστής*, which of course he was not: of the "Mars *tranquillus*" only Mars remained. It has been affirmed—even by some contemporary authors, who forget the parallel of Iguvium and the nonmartial duties of the *flamen Quirinalis*—that it was a question of two equivalent gods, one of whom was suitably Latin, the other Sabine, the god of "Cures," *ascitus Curibus*, imported by Titus Tatius at the time of synoecism. Thus, in one of the two variants of the legend of the origins, Quirinus became the "Sabine Mars."²⁴ Here, for example, is the explanation which Dionysius of Halicarnassus gives (2.48.2): "The Sabines and the Romans, who have learned it from them, give to Enyalios the name of Quirinus, without being able to affirm for certain whether he is Mars or some other god who enjoys the same honours as Mars. For some think that both these names are used of one and the same god who presides over martial combats [*πολεμικῶν ἀγόνων ἡγεμόνος*]; others, that the names are applied to two different gods of war [*δαιμόνων πολεμιστῶν*]." The existence of the Salii of Quirinus, of whom we shall talk shortly,²⁵ by the side of the Salii of Mars, only served to confirm the Greek interpreters in their opinion.

24. Above, pp. 70 and 169–70. But one must not argue against the Sabinity of Quirinus on the basis of the *qu-* of *Quirinus*, as I have done in NR and as Latte does, p. 113, n. 2. The fate of *qu-* coming from *c(o)u-* may have been different from that of a *qu-* inherited from Indo-European (> p).

25. Below, pp. 274–77.

The identification of Quirinus with Romulus ended on certain occasions in an equally total militarization. One recalls the vision which Proculus Julius had after the vanishing of the Founder. Plutarch, nourished on Greek philosophy, causes the new god to offer twofold counsel, promising the Romans the highest power if they will practice temperance along with bravery (*σωφροσύνην μετ' ἀνδρείας ἀσκοῦντες*), but the strictly Roman account seems not to have mentioned the temperance. The message of Romulus-Quirinus, in the condition it imposes as well as in its promise, is purely warlike as reported by Livy (1.16.7): "Go . . . and declare to the Romans the will of Heaven that my Rome shall be the capital of the world; so let them cherish the art of war, and let them know and teach their children that no human strength can resist Roman arms." This summons to conquer is voiced by Romulus, the son of Mars, but it is Quirinus, the posthumous Romulus, who takes over the glory and the burden of its execution.

Thus we see how the contradictions of a divine figure who has become too complex can be resolved. The warlike appeals of the Quirinus of Proculus Julius, in Livy, contradict term by term the prayer which the flamen of Quirinus, in Ovid, addresses to the goblin of wheat rust: *utilius gladios et tela nocentia carpes*. While the formula *Mars qui praeest paci*, through its simplification to plain "Mars," ends in the minds of the Greek observers in the *interpretatio* Enyalios, in Rome, through an amplification of "pax," it causes an assimilation with Janus, having the opposite meaning. Is not the great blessing of peace solemnly marked by the closing of the gates of Janus, whereas their opening signalizes Rome's entry into war? And does not the Hellenizing legend describe this Janus as the peaceful old king of a lost Age of Gold? He portrays himself in this way at the beginning of the *Fasti* (1.253-54), as more peaceable even than his colleague Portunus, who at least sends his flamen to grease the arms of Quirinus:

"I had naught to do with war: guardian was I of peace and doorways, and these," quoth he, showing the key, "these be the arms I bear."

It is not surprising that the two divine concepts of Janus and Quirinus were sometimes combined, without, however, giving rise to a permanent cult. The principal example, which is worth quoting, occurs in the passage of the *Res Gestae*, 13, where Augustus tells of the

three closings of the temple of Janus which his politics has made possible:

Janus Quirinus, whom our ancestors wished to be closed only when peace, the fruit of victories, should reign on land and on sea throughout the whole empire of the Roman people, has been closed three times, by decision of the Senate, under my principate.²⁶

And we know how Horace retouched the expression, in order to place the name of Quirinus in evidence and thus to reconstitute the archaic triad in the diptych formed by his last two odes: "He has closed the Janus of Quirinus, *Janum Quirini*, empty of wars."²⁷

Such, clarified as far as possible, is the most difficult of the great personages of Roman theology. If we remove the extensions which, under his name, are appropriate to Romulus or to Mars, the remaining picture enriches but does not contradict the one which the most archaic elements presented. To the ideas of organized social mass, the proper nourishment of that mass, and its general prosperity, is added the idea of peace, a watchful peace to be sure, and one which is linked to the wars which surround it, but a peace which is perfectly consistent with the interests of the "third function."²⁸

26. The expression may have occurred in the formula which preceded the *indictio belli* (Liv. I.32.10; *Jane* is a generally accepted correction for *Juno*), giving the enemy a last chance for peace. In this formula the *fetialis* avoids invoking Mars, and calls to witness only Jupiter, the guarantor of violated rights, and Janus(?) Quirinus, the double protector of threatened peace. It occurs in a fragment of Lucilius, but its intention there cannot be determined. Finally it appears, according to one of the variants of the theory of the *spolia opima* (Fest. p. 302 L²; above, pp. 166-68), in the "lex Numae" which prescribes, for the *tertia*, the sacrifice of a male lamb *Janui Quirino*. If the parallel texts name only Quirinus, the archaism of the form *Janui* seems to guarantee the antiquity of the alleged law, but the meaning of the double mention is not apparent. As for a *Juppiter Quirinus* (CIL, IX, 3303), it is more than improbable: "Jupiter—Mars—Quirinus et Janus," RHR 139 (1951): 208-15 (against V. Basanoff).

27. Wiss., pp. 201-2.

28. The reader will appreciate the verdict of the unfortunate C. Koch in his essay on Quirinus (above, n. 1), *Religio*, p. 21: "Ein überzeugendes Bild [on Quirinus] konnte noch niemand zeichnen. Insbesondere ist als völlig indiskutierbar das immer wieder erneut vorgetragene Theorem G. Dumézils abzulehnen, das kürzlich V. Basanoff modifiziert, aber nicht annehmbarer gemacht hat, in den Kultzeugnissen spiegele sich ein agrarischer Charakter des Gottes, und die altindische Kastenordnung liefere den Schlüssel zum Verständnis der römischen Verhältnisse; dem Juppiter eigene das priesterliche Element (flamen-Brahmane), dem Mars der Kriegerstand, dem Quirinus die Bauernkaste." Is it really so difficult in our studies to respect someone else's ideas? On page 21, n. 12, Koch makes a case of the opinion (A. Alföldi, in a letter) according to which Quirinus had the wild boar as his particular animal, as Mars had the wolf. Alföldi has in fact suggested recog-

We shall now quickly review some of the gods of the "group of Titus Tatius," in which Quirinus, as we have said, is only one term among many others. Is it necessary to specify once more that in speaking of Titus Tatius we do not mean to authenticate in the slightest degree the legend of the origins? Put simply, those who composed this group conformed to a natural division of theology. While the legend portrays the "Sabine component" as representing the third function (in terms of rural wealth and fecundity), it also ascribed to it many gods of that function, emphasizing their relationship in the same terms. From the composite list of the "gods of Titus Tatius," we shall in any case retain here only those figures who are definitely indigenous and who moreover have been associated, whether through collaboration or substitution, with Quirinus or with those divinities who have themselves been so associated with Quirinus.

Ops has already been mentioned in connection with her presence in the Regia, where she forms, with Jupiter's group and with Mars, a variant of the canonical triad, and in connection with her two feasts, the Opeconsivia of 25 August and the Opalia of 19 December. Her name is a personified abstraction, signifying abundance in general, but it is certain that agricultural abundance in particular is involved. In late times, a Greek interpretation as Rhea makes her the wife of Saturn interpreted as Kronos, but the epithet of *Consivia*, which she receives in the Regia, and the location of her two feasts after the two Consualia closely connect her with another old god, Consus. Consus,²⁹ the god of crops gathered and stored (*condere*), perhaps originally in underground storehouses, was honored at an underground altar in the valley of the Circus, at the foot of the Palatine; there he was surrounded by likenesses of several entities expressing various phases of agricultural activity, Seia, Segetia (or Segesta, or Messia), and

nizing Quirinus in the human head covered by a boar's head on the obverse of a series of Roman-Campanian coins bearing the word ROMA on the reverse (first half of the third century B.C.; see, for example, H. Grueber, *The Coins of the Roman Republic in the British Museum*, vol. 3 [1910], pl. 75, 9 and 13). If this hypothesis could be proved, it would be interesting: the boar is the characteristic animal consecrated to the great Vanic god Freyr (above, pp. 71 and 257-58) in Scandinavian mythology. But see above, p. 237, n. 49.

29. Most recently, P. H. N. G. Stehouwer, *Etude sur Ops et Consus*, Diss. Utrecht (1956). On the cults of the valley of the Circus and the altars and small buildings of the *spina*, see Lugli, *RA*, pp. 599-616. In *IR*, pt. III, chap. 4, I proposed an explanation for the reduplication of the festivals of Consus and Ops (August, December) and for the difference in the names of Ops's festivals (August: *Opeconsivia*; December: *Opalia*).

especially Tutilina, who had a more general function, closely resembling that of the god. According to Saint Augustine (*Ciu. D.* 4.8), she watches over *frumentis collectis atque reconditis, ut tute seruarentur*; also, says Pliny (*N.H.* 18.8), her name—which he does not even wish to transcribe—must not be pronounced. As the feast of Consus included horse races, the interpreters Grecized him as Ποσειδῶν Ἰππιος, which resulted in his reinterpretation as *Neptunus equestris*,³⁰ and finally as plain Neptunus. The poets of the Empire make him the brother of Jupiter and Dis, as Poseidon is the brother of Zeus and Pluto; but these are the pastimes of writers, with no more significance than the pun which transformed him into a *deus consilii*. Was it this false etymology which caused the rape of the Sabine women to fall on the day of his feast, or, since the Sabines had to be the component of the third function in the "Roman synthesis," did a more or less conscious logic suggest the placement of this god at the beginning of the whole episode? In any case, this choice assumes that the Consualia antedated synoecism, and as a result Consus cannot have appeared in the list of the "gods of Titus," by the side of Ops. As for Ops herself, the honor which is paid to her of representing the entire body of third-functional gods in the Regia is a remarkable parallel with an Indian and especially with a Scandinavian fact. An Indo-Iranian personification of abundance, whom the Ṛg Veda calls *Puramdhi*, shows a special affinity with one of the sovereign gods, Bhaga, who is himself concerned with the distribution of goods.³¹ The personification of the same concept among the Germanic peoples (ON *Fulla*, OHG *Volla*) is connected, at least in Scandinavia, not with the Vanir divinities, but directly with the sovereign god Óðinn and with his wife. Thus it seems that at a very early time "Abundance," the result rather than the motive of rural activity, was inclined to part company with the technicians of this activity in order to live with the kings.³²

The divinity whom Varro calls Larunda is doubtless the same as Larenta, at whose "tomb," on the Velabrum, a sacrifice was offered on 23 December. The figure of Larenta is shadowy and elusive. She is probably identical with Acca Larenti(n)a, who is not a goddess

30. Once too, since Consus has an underground altar, he is compared with Poseidon Ἐνοσίχθων.

31. Above, p. 201.

32. "QII. 13, le *sacrarium Opis* dans la *Regia*," *REL* 39 (1961): 257-61.

but the heroine of two rival legends.³³ In one she is a courtesan who, as a reward for spending a night in the sanctuary of Hercules, became fabulously wealthy and willed her fortune to the Roman people, who celebrate her annually in the Larentalia; in the other, which is probably more recent, she is the wet nurse of Romulus and Remus, the wife of the shepherd who adopted them. The two accounts have third-functional motives: on the one hand, sensuality and commerce in pleasure, wealth, and generosity; on the other hand, the "rearing" of small children.³⁴ In both, too, a simple mortal woman is concerned, a fact which causes the Larentalia to be portrayed as an act of funerary worship, a *parentatio*. The sources are not in agreement concerning the priest or priests who officiated at this ceremony. Aulus Gellius (7.7.7) names the flamen of Quirinus, which is not surprising, since a mythic figure of the third function is involved. Perhaps this might explain, once Quirinus has been assimilated to Romulus, the fact that Larenti(n)a had been introduced into the latter's legend as a nurse. Plutarch (*Rom.* 4.7) names "the priest of Mars," which is certainly false, but which might be understood as a Greek approximation for the priest of Enyalios, that is, of Quirinus. Macrobius (1.10.15) writes imprecisely *per flaminem*. According to Cicero (*Ep. ad Brut.* 1.15.8) it is the *pontifices* who celebrate the Larentalia, and according to Varro (*L.L.* 6.23), *sacerdotes nostri*. It is possible that these texts may be reconciled in the sense that several priests, the pontiffs as well as the flamen of Quirinus, took part in the rites, as the *pontifex maximus* and Jupiter's flamen did in the *confarreatio*, and as the pontiffs and the flamen of Mars did for the sacrifice of the *Equus October* (according to Cass. Dio 43.24.4).³⁵

33. See lastly Pestalozza, "Mater Larum e Acca Larentia," *R. Inst. Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere, Rendiconti*, 46 (1933): 905-60; A. Momigliano, *Tre figure mitiche, Tanaquilla, Gaia Cecilia, Acca Larentia* (1938); D. Sabbatucci, "Il mito di Acca Larentia," *SMSR* 29 (1958): 41-76. Still see the fine essay which opens (pp. 1-12) the second volume of T. Mommsen's *Römische Forschungen*: "Die echte und die falsche Acca Larentia." Cf. below, p. 341, n. 20.

34. Some make Larentia the mother of the "Fratres Arvales," prototypes of the priests charged with the mystical protection of the fields (Gell. 7.7.8).

35. It is also possible that Varro's expression states the "genus" instead of the "species" ("the Roman priests" rather than the particular priest—the *flamen Quirinalis*—who officiates on this occasion), since in his eyes the important thing, in this passage, was solely the fact that there was a cult. Similarly Cicero's expression (addressed to M. Brutus: *Larentiae . . . cui uos pontifices ad aram in Velabro facere soletis*) may refer not to the pontiffs *stricto sensu*, but to the whole *collegium pontificum*, of which the *flamen Quirinalis* is a member. G. Rohde, *Die Kultsätze der römischen Pontifices*, *RVV* 25 (1936): 123, thinks that two feasts must be distinguished (one in April: Plut. *Rom.* 4.7; one in December), with different

The cult of Flora, along with the springtime Floralia, is known at an era and under circumstances of its foundation (238) and celebration which make a Greek influence very probable. The mark of an *'Αφροδίτη* *'Ανθεία*³⁶ has been discerned in her. But the goddess is authentically Roman. She appears in Sabine and in Samnite territory (where she is associated with Ceres,³⁷ whose *ministra* she became in Rome, according to *Schol. in Juvenalem* 6.249), and in Rome itself she is served by one of the twelve *flamines minores*, a certificate of antiquity which is confirmed by her presence on the list of divinities to whom the *Fratres Arvales* sacrifice. Her name, in another declension, is that of the flower, and her natural role is to protect, at the moment of flowering, not so much the ornamental plants as the cereals (*Aug. Ciu. D.* 4.8) and other useful plants, including trees. But secondary meanings also devolved on her. Her name, like that of *Ops Consiva*, was thought of as "the" secret name of Rome, the dissimulation of which was important to the mystical security of the state.³⁸ In this quality, and also as a representative of the third function below Jupiter and below Mars, thus forming with them a variant of the canonical triad Jupiter-Mars-Quirinus, she seems to have been involved in the oldest chariot races, as patroness of the "Greens."³⁹ A legend, which she shares with Larentia, makes her in addition a courtesan and the benefactress of the Roman people: having accumulated a great fortune through the profitable use of her body, she is supposed to have bequeathed this fortune to the people, at the price of an annual celebration of the Floralia. This tradition, definitely a late one, is nevertheless not empty. Like the great freedom which prevailed at the Floralia, it attests the natural ties existing in Rome between fecundity and pleasure, between the flowering of nature and

officiating priests. In any case, it seems impossible to exclude the *flamen Quirinalis*, who is mentioned by Aulus Gellius in a chapter filled with specifications concerning Acca Larentia and her cult. Consistently with his system, Kurt Latte writes (p. 92, n. 3): "Es ist durchaus möglich, dass der *flamen Quirinalis* einmal die Aufgabe übernommen hat, vielleicht im Zusammenhang mit dem Wiederaufleben des Quirinskults in augusteischer Zeit." But the *flamens* were not thus at the disposition of the government.

36. However, there are ancient Italic rites in the cult of Flora, H. Le Bonniec, *Le culte de Cérés à Rome* (1958), pp. 199-200.

37. Vetter, n. 147, line 24 (table of Agnone) *Fluusaí Kerriai* "Florae Ceriali"; an uncertain masculine *Floro-* (dative *φλουροι*), *ibid.* n. 183.

38. A. Brelich, *Die geheime Schutzgottheit von Rom* (1949), p. 37.

39. *RIER*, pp. 45-61 ("Albati russati uirides"), and *DL*, pp. 120-21.

the sensual pleasures of men, areas which other Indo-European societies also combine in the third function. We must here take note of Pomona, the protectress of fruits, who is parallel to Flora. Like Flora, she is provided with a flamen, who is regarded as the least of the *minores*, "because the fruits of trees are the least bulky products." In the old calendars neither Pomona nor Flora has a feast, and though a place called Pomonal is indicated on the road to Ostia, no festival called *Pomonalia* ever occurs. Wissowa thought with some justification that the cult of these divinities was movable and determined by the progress of the crops.⁴⁰

The ancient nature of Saturn, *Sāturnus* (epigraphic variant *Saetur-nus*), cannot be ascertained for lack of a clear etymology.⁴¹ Several authors maintain that he is Etruscan, but what do we know about it? Along with his Saturnalia of 17 December, he is engulfed by the Greek god Kronos, to whom the interpreters assimilated him, and as a result, he is "married" to Ops-Rhea, who is his neighbor on the calendar, but in ancient times was closer to Consus. Even before this, however, he had already been reinterpreted by virtue of a word-play, not accepted by modern linguists, on *sata* "sown things, sowings." It must be in this quality that he appears on the list of the "gods of Titus Tatius," near Ops and Flora. All that can be said about the earliest Saturn is that in the time of the monarchy he had an altar in the southwest part of the Forum, the establishment of which was attributed to the companions of Hercules, and which the last Etruscan king decided to replace with a temple. As in the case of the Capitol, however, he was overtaken by the Republic, and it was the consuls who dedicated the building in 497. After surviving without incident throughout the Republic, it was rebuilt in 42 B.C.; burned in A.D. 283 and reconstructed by Diocletian, it had the good fortune to last until the end of the Empire. Unfortunately, we learn nothing from its antiquity, nor its vitality, nor the localization of the cult, any more than from the very important but secondary use which was made of the *templum Saturni*, especially under the Republic: the public treasury,

40. On the *Pomones*, see above, p. 43, n. 10.

41. E. Manni, "A proposito del culto di Saturno," *Athenaeum* 16 (1938): 223-38; the author thinks that the development of the cult was a result of the Punic wars. Cf. M. Leglay, *Saturne africain: histoire* (1966) ("Le Baal punique," "Substrat berbère," etc.), discussed by J. Février, *JA* 254 (1966): 505-11. See also the conjectures of A. Brelich, *Tre variazioni romane sul tema delle origini* (1956), pp. 75-87.

the *aerarium*, was kept there under the care of the quaestors. Nor do we know what to make of the association of Saturn with Lua Mater. The pontifical formulas (Gell. 13.23.2) named *Lua Saturni* in the same context as the *Nerio Martis*, the *Virites Quirini*, etc., which means that here too the abstraction must make explicit an important characteristic of the god. The only thing we know about Lua is that she formed, along with Mars, Minerva (the latter probably standing for Nerio), and Vulcan, the list of divinities *quibus spolia hostium dicare ius fasque est*. On the other hand, her name is taken from the verb *luere* in its generalized meaning, of which it was dispossessed by its unacknowledged compound, *soluere*. These two facts suggest that Lua was "Dissolution," destruction personified, hence a dangerous but sometimes useful force, as for example when it was a question of destroying the arms taken from the enemy and thus by sympathetic action weakening those which remained in his hands.⁴² But, in view of our ignorance concerning the true significance of her associate Saturn, it is profitless to form hypotheses on the part played in her definition by this function of dissolution.

42. "Lua Mater" in *DL*, pp. 99-115.

6

THE ARCHAIC TRIAD : COMPLEMENTS

Before concluding our study of this venerable and central section of Roman theology, it is fitting that we return, strengthened by the analyses which have just been made of Jupiter, Mars, and Quirinus, to certain oppositions or articulations which we have observed among them, either in pairs or in the whole triad itself.

As we have seen,¹ Wissowa included the ritual by which, according to him, the *fetiales* concluded a treaty among the formulary attestations of the triad. As proof of this he offered a passage from Polybius, 3.25.6. Actually, a regularly used formula is not involved here. As in every case concerning an oath, there is only one guarantor of treaties, Jupiter, on whom in fact the *fetiales* depend. It is he, and he alone, who is called to witness by the priest in the definitely formulaic sentences reproduced by Livy in his account of the agreement between the Romans and the Albans over the struggle of the Horatii and Curiatii (1.24.7-8):² "Hear, Jupiter; hear, *pater patratus* of the Alban People; hear ye, People of Alba: From these terms . . . the Roman People will not be the first to depart. If it shall first depart from them, by general consent, with malice aforethought, then on that day do thou, great Jupiter, so smite the Roman People as I shall here to-day smite this pig: and so much the harder smite them as thy power and thy strength are greater." Thus the presence of the two other gods in addition to Jupiter must be explained by the special circumstances which Polybius's account describes in detail. Considered in this way, the text provides a very useful lesson.

At the moment when the destruction of Saguntum in Spain marks

1. Above, p. 142. I did so myself from *JMQ*, 1941, until *Idéol.*, 1958.

2. Above, pp. 91-93.

the beginning of the Second Punic War,³ the historian feels himself bound (chap. 21) to specify exactly what had been the sworn diplomatic status of Rome and Carthage, ever since the beginning of their relations. Two old treaties (the first dating from the first two consuls and probably apocryphal, perhaps reconstructed on the basis of the second)⁴ define the geographical zones of sovereignty or control which each party concedes to the other and promises to respect. There is no provision for an alliance, or for a war undertaken by either against a third party, and in general no military clause is formulated (chaps. 22-24). With the invasion of Sicily by Pyrrhus, the unforeseen "third party," the two cities experience the need to adjust their respective positions to the new circumstances (chap. 25) by a new text. This text confirms at first the preceding treaties. But military clauses are added: to what extent may each of the two parties contract an alliance with the third? If one of them is attacked in the zone which it controls, to what extent must the other render assistance? The forms of this assistance are scrupulously stated. The Carthaginians reserve for themselves the monopoly of maritime transport of troops, even of Roman troops; in all situations they will provide the ships for troop movement and for attack, with each of the two peoples assuming responsibility for the supplying (*τὰ ὀψώνια*: victualing, pay) of their own troops. But a limit to the collaboration is set: nobody will force the crews to debark, if they do not wish to.

In swearing this treaty, the Romans invoke three gods, not collectively for the whole agreement, but separately for the two parts. The confirmation of the earlier texts, simple agreements to coexistence containing nothing but promises of mutual respect, is sworn by *Zeὺς Λίθος*, that is, Jupiter Lapis, following a ritual which Polybius describes briefly. In this ritual the stone is used differently than by Livy's *pater patratus*, but with a formula, equivalent to that in Livy, which Polybius translates into Greek. The additional new clauses, which concern war and the organization of a collaborative effort on

3. I do not examine here the historical aspect of the event, nor the confusions possibly committed with regard to it.

4. However, in his well-balanced article, "The History of Rome in the Regal Period," *JRS* 47 (1957): 64, P. Fraccaro accepts the date and the terms of the first treaty; likewise E. Hampl, "Das Problem der Datierung der ersten Vorträge zwischen Rom und Karthago," *RhM* 101 (1958): 58-75. On Pol. 3.25, see G. Nenci, "Il trattato romano-cartaginesiense *κατὰ τὴν διάθεσιν*," *Historia* 7 (1958): 283. Cf. A. Aymard, "Les deux premiers traités entre Rome et Carthage," *REL* 59 (1957): 277-93, reprinted in *Etudes d'histoire ancienne* (posthumous), 1967.

land and sea, is sworn by *Ἄρης* and *Ἐνυάλιος*, Mars and Quirinus. One might think that Polybius's version is inaccurate and that Jupiter covers the whole treaty, with Mars and Quirinus serving only as adjuncts to him in the second part: it is hard to imagine any agreement from which Jupiter would be excluded. But, for the interpretation of the triad, the essential point is that Mars and Quirinus become involved when the military clauses occur, as if Jupiter had become inadequate there. The presence of Mars is immediately justified in the clauses dealing with war, but what is Quirinus doing there? It is probable that in the juxtaposition of these two gods Polybius understands only what is suggested by the juxtaposition of the two names in Greek, that is, two apparently equivalent varieties of Ares, or Mars. We have seen above that this was one of the evolutions of Quirinus, especially among writers using the Greek language, and that a Dionysius of Halicarnassus, among others, is as it were a prisoner of the interpretation of Quirinus as Enyalios. But we seem to be dealing here with an authentic Roman procedure. What precise meaning is to be ascribed to the conjoint mention of Mars and Quirinus? Since the period is already a late one, it is possible that Quirinus, understood as Romulus the founder and protector of Rome, is no more than an indissociable double of Mars, as he is, for example, in the legend of the battle of Sentinum. But it is also possible that there is a difference in their competences. The appearance of the "third party," Pyrrhus, raises for the two friendly peoples not merely questions of free military cooperation but others which lie at the very limit of peace and war, involving a threatened peace, and in which vigilance is necessary. The first clause conveys an idea of the complexity of the casuistry: if one of the two peoples, Roman or Carthaginian, concludes a written alliance with Pyrrhus, it will be obliged to specify its right, in case the other people is attacked, of going to its assistance! Even in their military collaboration, limits and conditions of nonbelligerence are provided. The Carthaginians undertake to furnish the vessels for the transportation of Roman troops, and even for attack, but "let nobody force the crews to debark (and then to fight), if they do not want to . . ." Mars was not adequate to cover these considerable niceties; for this, Quirinus, as we have understood him, was needed.

The tradition according to which the Salii were in *tutela Jouis Martis Quirini*, and which we know through a brief note of Servius, has been defended above: there is indeed one group of Salii belonging to Mars and another belonging to Quirinus, and the talismanic quality of the *ancilia*, as well as the celestial origin of their prototype, makes it natural for Jupiter to take an interest in them.⁵ But the coexistence of the two groups raises a problem, for which Lucien Gerschel has provided a fine solution, which I shall sum up here.⁶

The two months in which the Salii make themselves manifest are those which bracket the season for warfare, and in particular the two feasts related to arms, in which they display their talents, correspond to each other, before and after the battles: Quinquatrus on 19 March and Armilustrium on 19 October. The technical expressions are, in March, *ancilia mouere*, in October, *ancilia condere*. By their arms and their dances the Salii serve not only to open but to close the summer campaign religiously, and on both occasions, in a different way but with the same effect as Janus (who moreover is named in the *carmen Saliare*), they assure a transition, either from war to peace or from peace to war. Why should not the *Mars belli*, that is, plain Mars, and the *Mars tranquillus* who is Quirinus collaborate in these operations which take place on the boundary of their domains, at the very hinge of their activities? The two teams of Salii do not have to share their tasks, only Mars's team opening the way to war, and only Quirinus's the way to peace. On each occasion both teams are required, for a kind of transferral of power from one god to the other. It is hardly necessary to suppose that they were differentiated in their ritual action: Quirinus, the god of watchful peace, is armed like Mars, the god of war. Thus it is in the same accoutrements and by the same dances that they signalize the succession of their gods, neither of whom destroys but rather each of whom completes the other and even, through his action, prepares for the other's return. This idea of preparation is certainly basic; as we have seen, it is what justifies the greasing of the *arma Quirini*, an act of maintenance entrusted to the priest of the god of gates. And again, it is what is expressed in the legends of the founding of the two groups. Indeed Gerschel has remarked a kind of chiasmus between the authors and the bene-

5. Above, pp. 146-47 and 166.

6. "Saliens de Mars et Saliens de Quirinus," *RHR* 138 (1950): 145-51.

ficiaries of these foundings. It is the peaceable Numa who creates the Salii of Mars Gradivus (Liv. 1.20.4), foreseeing the future wars of kings less tranquil than himself. On the other hand, it is Tullus Hostilius, the most bellicose, the most strictly military of the pre-Etruscan kings, who in the midst of battle, disturbed at the prospect of a prolonged and indecisive war, promises to institute the second group of Salii "if he conquered the Sabines that day" (Dion. 3.32.4). Just as the completely pacific Numa serves Mars and the transition to war, so the completely warlike Tullus serves Quirinus and makes his vow to allow the hard-pressed Romans to pass, under the desired conditions, from war to peace. The founding of the second group of Salii is associated in the vow of Tullus with that of the Saturnalia (should this be understood to mean the Consualia?) and the Opalia of December, which "the Romans," says Dionysius, "celebrate . . . every year after they have gathered in all their fruits of the earth."

This last idea conveys all the grandeur of the Salian machinery. Beyond the words of war and peace are the motives and the results or war and peace—bravery, strength, and victory; agriculture, fecundity, and prosperity—which the dancer-priests alternately guarantee, thanks to the sacred talismans of the sovereign god. Moreover the collaboration of the two groups guarantees at the same time something above war and peace: the continuity of political and cultic life, of power and religion. Thus these talismans, despite the uniformity of their appearance, and like those of the Scythians with their variety of form,⁷ thoroughly cover the zones of the three functions.⁸

We shall leave this summary picture of the three functions after two remarks.

First we shall indicate a type of problem which it tends to raise, and of which few examples have been discussed up to now.⁹ This type of

7. Above, p. 166 and n. 27.

8. On the buckler of the Salii, and on their war dance, clarified by an archaic vase (from the beginning of the seventh century) which was found near the lake of Bolsena, see R. Bloch, "Sur les danses armées des Saliens," *Annales: Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 13 (1958): 706-15; *Les origines de Rome* (1959), 134-37. (However, I doubt that the figurines on the vase are taking part in a dance of hunters.); W. Helbig, "Sur les attributs des Saliens," *MAI* 37, pt. 2 (1906): 205-76; P. Boyancé, "Un rite de purification dans les Argonautiques de Valerius Flaccus," *REL* 13 (1935): 107-36.

9. This sums up the fourth essay in *RIER*, "Bellator equos," 73-91.

study, one might say this type of experiment, using the word in the meaning which physicists give to it, consists in observing what happens when the qualified representatives or important applications of each of the three functions come into contact or establish a relationship with one and the same material being, or abstract notion, or social mechanism: earth, gold, and the metals; the principal animals; life and death, youth and age; marriage, friendship, the family; simple numbers which are easily endued with symbolism, such as "two," "three," etc. One of the most useful of these "reagents" has been the horse. Here, in summary, are the results of the investigation.

On the first level two contrary relations are observed, in connection with two aspects of Jupiter. On his flamen, as we have seen, weighs the interdiction against mounting a horse (Plut. Q.R. 40; Gell. 10.15.3), probably because the horse suggests war, along with the contaminations of death which it involves and which the priest avoids in every situation, real or symbolic. Inversely, the Jupiter O.M. of the Capitol, the sovereign god of republican times, has four-horse chariots on the pediment of his temple, and it is in such a chariot that the victorious general rides to the Capitol as a sovereign during the few hours of his triumph. But, when Camillus yokes a team of white horses to his chariot, Rome cries sacrilege, since such a team is reserved for the god. Moreover, the question of sacrifice is not involved: the horse is never offered as a victim to Jupiter. It is only a symbol of his power.

It is on the second level that the horse is a victim, in a single but important ceremony: the October Horse, the horse offered to Mars and killed with a javelin, as a sacrifice whose effects are concentrated on the Regia under the conditions described above.¹⁰

Finally on the third level the horse is nothing more than an economic asset and a source of power for work. Although nothing connects it with Quirinus, a god on the same level, Consus, is concerned with it to the extent that his *interpretatio graeca*, very inadequate otherwise, was Poseidon Ἰππιος. The kind of interest which the horse brings to Consus is clarified by what happens on the day of his feast, probably that of 26 August rather than the one on 19 December. The horse, and with it the other equine draft and pack animals, asses and mules, are exempted from work and crowned with flowers (Dion.

10. See above, 215-28.

1.33.2, who recognizes in the Consualia a heritage from the Hippocrateia of Arcadia; Plut. Q.R. 48). It is plain that the horse is here regarded not in terms of its singular nobility or efficiency, but merely as one equine animal among the others, the common element in their description being work. Plutarch gives a good explanation, in the form of a question: "If the ass shares with the horse exemption from service in the *Consualia*," he says, "is it not because, as an associate of the horse in work, it also takes its rest with him?" The same characteristic attitude occurs regarding the races which took place on this day—races which, in the legend of Romulus, provided the opportunity for the rape of the Sabines' daughters. Undoubtedly horses raced in them, but principally hinnies and mules (βούρδωνες: Malalas, *Chronographia*, *Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae* [1831], p. 178; muli: Paul. p. 266 L²).

These very different kinds of connection are definitely ancient. From what we know of the role played by the horse in the migrations and conquests of the Indo-European bands, we might expect other Indo-European peoples to present a similar picture. Indeed, such is the case with Vedic India.

On the first level, two sovereign gods, the calm and judicial Mitra and the formidable Varuṇa are contrasted as the *brāhman* and the *kṣatrá* (the latter in the sense of temporal royal power). Neither in the hymns nor in any ritual is Mitra associated with the horse, and during the classical era, one of the prohibitions affecting the well-bred brahman forbids him to read the Vedas while mounted on a horse, or indeed on any other animal or means of transport (*Manu* 4.120). On the other hand, the ritual books repeat, "the horse is of Varuṇa," *sa hi vāruṇo yad ásvaḥ*. (*Sat.Brāhm.* 4.2.1.11; etc.)—though the fact of its so belonging is never translated in terms of a sacrifice.

In contrast, it is on the second level, in the *ásvamedha*, a *kṣatriya* sacrifice (*kṣatrá* in the sense of the second-functional principle), that the horse is a victim, to the advantage of the king, under conditions which make it, as we have seen, the exact parallel of the *Equus* October.

Finally, on the third level, although the Nāsātya twins are called by their other name, *Áśvin*, a word derived from *ásva* "horse"; although one of their duties was certainly the maintenance and healing of horses; and lastly although the chariot on which they ride

to the sacrifice is sometimes described as being yoked to horses (RV 1.117.2, etc.), it is also—and it alone, in the world of the gods—drawn by asses (1.34.9; 8.85.7). In the enumeration of their lofty deeds, hymn 1.116.2 proclaims: “The ass, O Nāsatya, in the race, in the concourse of Yama, has won by its victory a thousandweight . . .,” and in *Aitar.Brāhm.* 17.1.4–3.4, a race and a victory of this kind are mentioned, and there “the Aśvin won with asses.”

The correspondence is thus complete, and is particularly remarkable on the third level.

On the other hand, we must emphasize the most general characteristic of the Jupiter-Mars-Quirinus triad: it is a mechanism of differentiation, as much as, if not more than, a mechanism of harmonization.

If the cases in which the triad appears as a group in the cult are so few, especially if the three major flamens cooperate only on the occasion of the sacrifice to Fides, this may certainly be due to erosion, and to the lack of interest in this representation and in this priesthood in the religion of the Republic, but primarily it is due to their nature. The three terms define in religious thought three areas whose fundamental interdependence, once it has been acknowledged and from time to time recalled, is of less practical importance than their diversity. It is less important for Jupiter, Mars, and Quirinus to meet, all three together, or even in pairs, than for each to administer his vast domain; and in the course of history they did not have to lose a common sanctuary or a unitary festival, since these never existed. If one calls only the constant, permanent, and somehow physical union of three gods a triad, then Jupiter, Mars, and Quirinus are not even a triad: and this too has been maintained.¹¹ But how then are we to express their relations? It is better to keep the term, which refers only to their number, while we prepare to observe triads of an entirely different kind.

11. Mme L. Banti, p. 196 of an important article, “Il culto del cosiddetto ‘tempio dell’ Apollo’ a Veii e il problema delle triadi etrusco-italiche,” *SE* 17 (1943): 187–224. See below, p. 685 and n. 139.

SECOND PART

ANCIENT THEOLOGY

I

THE CAPITOLINE TRIAD

CAPITOLINE JUPITER

When the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus “was born”—on the Ides of September, in the 245th year of the city, according to the Romans—it had a long history, which flattering and delusive legends have irretrievably hidden. The first Etruscan king, it was said, had vowed to build it during the course of a war against the Sabines, and had started work on it, but its final completion was attributed to his grandson, the last king. The chosen site, consisting of rocky declivities, did not facilitate the enterprise. The leveling of the ground and the establishment of a formidable artificial platform were so costly that the resources with which Tarquin the Proud expected to raise the building as far as the roof—contributions from allies and booty obtained from Suessa Pometia—were barely enough to pay for the foundations. The annalistic tradition, which does not treat the tyrants tenderly, nevertheless gives evidence of sincere respect for the grandiose ideas of this Cheops of Latium. The Capitoline sanctuary crowned a vast effort of construction and civilization, from which indeed he was not to be dissociated (Liv. I.56.1–2):

Being intent upon completing the temple, the king called in workmen from every quarter of Etruria, and used for this purpose not only the state funds but labourers drawn from the commons. This work was far from light in itself, and was added to their military service. Yet the plebeians felt less abused at having to build with their own hands the temples of the gods, than they did when they came to be transferred to other tasks also, which, while less in show, were yet rather more laborious. I mean the erection of seats in the circus, and the construction underground of the Great Sewer, as a

receptacle for all the offscourings of the City,—two works for which the new splendour of these days has scarcely been able to produce a match.

It was said finally that the royal builder had been denied the honor of dedicating his creation. His excesses and those of his sons had forced Rome to revolt, and it was one of the first “consuls” who delivered the temple to the god. The account is one of those in which the Romans delighted, because it exhibits a harmonious blending of the pettifogging guile and the spiritual grandeur of which they were capable. For us it is a good illustration of the way in which these superstitious men were able to preserve their liberty and to follow their own wishes in their relations with the gods (Liv. 2.8.6–8):

The temple of Jupiter on the Capitol had not yet been dedicated. Valerius and Horatius the consuls drew lots to determine which should do it. Horatius received the lot, and Publicola [one of the legendary fathers of the Republic, P. Valerius Publicola] set out to conduct the war against the Veientes. With more bitterness than was reasonable, the friends of Valerius resented that the dedication of so famous a temple should be given to Horatius. They tried in all sorts of ways to hinder it, but their schemes all came to naught. Finally, when the consul's hand was on the door-post and he was in the midst of his prayers to the gods, they broke in upon the ceremony with the evil tidings that his son was dead, averring that whilst the shadow of death was over his house he could not dedicate a temple. Whether he did not believe the news to be true, or possessed great fortitude, we are not informed with certainty, nor is it easy to decide. Without permitting himself to be diverted from his purpose by the message, further than to order that the body should be buried, he kept his hand upon the door-post, finished his prayer, and dedicated the temple.

Such is the last of the “pretty stories” which obscure the birth of Rome's most important religious monument.

The foundations, deeply embedded in the chalk and tufa of the hill, were so well made that centuries later, after the burnings, in spite of some slippages which Livy mentions, they were still able to support increasingly more substantial constructions. Executed by Etruscan workmen, the first temple was made, at least at its base, of blocks of volcanic rock covered with stucco, and measured sixty meters by fifty. Sensibly oriented to the south, the façade was fronted with a portico. Massive columns supported a pediment which was

ornamented, in the Etruscan manner, with statues of painted terra-cotta. A quadriga of the same composition dominated this decoration until it was replaced by another, of bronze, in 296, the year preceding the victory at Sentinum. The principal divinities were housed in three *cellae*,¹ Jupiter in the central one and his two associates, Juno and Minerva, in those on the right and left, respectively. Probably the statues of all three were of terra-cotta, but only the figure of the master of the place captured the attention of the antiquaries. Following Varro, Pliny reports (*N.H.* 35.157) that a famous artist, Volca of Veii, had modeled it at the command of Tarquin the Old. It has sometimes been doubted that any divine images occupied the *cellae* as early as this, but the discovery at Veii of a statue of Apollo which is at least contemporaneous makes the tradition more than likely. It was an innovation. The plastic representation of the gods certainly did not involve the religious mutation which the primitivists claim: Jupiter did not have to wait for his statue in order to be a person. From this time forward, however, the Romans could see him, and beyond the Etruscan treatment, it was the Greek Zeus who was already implanted in their imagination.

Through the piety of wealthy citizens and the flattery of vassal kings, the Capitoline temple gradually became a storehouse for works of art, and one reads with some discomfort that in the second century B.C. the ceiling was gilded through the efforts of the destroyer of Corinth, the barbarous L. Mummius Achaicus, then serving as censor.

On the other hand, the god's quality as guarantor of oaths and the strong position of the temple made it the conservatory for precious archives. The tables on which diplomatic acts were engraved were privileged to grow old on its walls, as well as on those of the neighboring temple of *Dius Fidius*. It was here too that the Republic housed its relief treasury, reserved for extreme emergencies, and the Sibylline Books, which rendered it so many services.

1. Contemporary temples with three *cellae* have been discovered in other places in Latium, for example on the acropolis of Ardea, in 1930. E. Stefani, *NS*, 1944-45, pp. 91-94; D. S. Robertson, *A Handbook of Greek and Roman Architecture* (1954), p. 200 and Appendix I (a list of the Etrusco-Italic temples). A very good study by U. Bianchi, "Disegno storico del culto Capitolino nell' Italia romana e nelle provincie dell' Impero," *MAL*, 2d ser., 7 [1949]: 347-415; by the same author, "Questions sur les origines du culte capitolin," *Lat.* 10 (1951): 341-66. Earlier, A. Kirsopp Lake, "The Archaeological Evidence for the 'Tuscan Temple,'" *MAAR* 12 (1935): 89-149.

Repaired, beautified, and transformed, the original edifice lasted until the year 83 B.C., when it was totally destroyed, along with all its contents, by a fire whose causes were never determined. It was a bad era. Here is how Julius Obsequens, in his collection of Prodigies, 57, describes the background of the event:

After five years of absence, L. Sulla returned victoriously to Italy, and this was a time of great terror for his adversaries. Through the fault of an *aedituus*, the Capitol was burned in one night. Sulla's cruelty made a frightful proscription of the principal citizens. It is said that a hundred thousand men perished in the Italic war and in the civil war.

As dictator, Sulla undertook the reconstruction which Caesar had time to complete, in 46, before taking his place among the stars. The new building was of white marble. The triple colonnade in front and the columns on the sides had been borrowed, by Sulla's order, from the temple of Olympian Zeus at Athens. In the front, beneath the inevitable quadriga, the goddess Roma was enthroned, along with the she-wolf and her nurslings.

Burned once again in the street fights which brought Vespasian to power; rebuilt immediately; accidentally burned nine years later, and restored by Domitian, the temple lasted this time until the final, irreparable disasters. In A.D. 455, summoned by the empress Eudoxia, the Vandal and Arian king Genseric, the second scourge of God, disembarked at Ostia, occupied the city without striking a blow, and despite the entreaties of Pope Leo, subjected it to pillage for two interminable weeks. The temple of the Capitol, which Domitian had hoped to make the major imperial sanctuary, lost all its riches. The German leader even removed part of the gilded bronze tiles which covered the roof. In the second quarter of the seventh century Pope Honorius I reused the remainder in the construction of the new basilica of Saint Peter, and with this symbolic transferral of material a career of more than eleven hundred years was ended. The ensuing degradation of the ruins and the spiritual transformation were so complete that even the memory of the place was lost where, on four occasions, the greatest empire of pre-Christian times had planted its trust. Even though the northwest corner of the basement had been discovered in 1578 and again in 1680, until 1875 it was still being argued whether the temple should be looked for on the *arx*

or on the Capitol proper. This doubt was removed between 1865 and 1875, when the eastern edge of the platform and a few fragments of the southern face were marked out. Of the sanctuary itself very little was found.²

We have already shown what Jupiter O.M. represents in Roman ideology, and the changes which occurred in the archaic conception of the god.³ Let us now observe him in action in the politico-religious life of Rome, of which he is the head.

The humble raw materials of Roman power and its most eminent trustees both pay him equal homage. Every boy assuming the manly toga, that is, entering the body of useful citizens, comes to the Capitol to offer a sacrifice (Serv. II *Ecl.* 4.49), and it is at the Capitol that the consuls start their year of power. They did this originally, we are told, on the anniversary day of the foundation, the Ides of September; later, on the Calends of January, and with the most solemn formality (*processus consularis*, Ov. *F.* 1.79; *Pont.* 4.4.23-42; etc.). Having taken the auspices on the preceding night, the new leaders of Rome don their insignia and proceed to Jupiter's temple, accompanied by the Senate, the magistrates, the priests, and the people. They offer the sacrifice promised by their predecessors and formulate their own vows. The Senate then enters the temple and holds its first session, presided over by the consuls; this session seems to be chiefly concerned with questions of religion (Liv. 9.8.1; 22.1.6; etc.). Then, with the same pomp, the consuls come down again and are led back to their homes.

Although the armies on campaign assemble on the other side of the walls, in the domain of Mars, the administration of the army and the supervisory direction of war are Jupiter's affair. It is in *Capitolium*, probably into the court of the temple, that the consul comes to organize the levying of troops (Liv. 26.31.11; Pol. 6.19.6), and here he convokes the magistrates or deputies of the Latin allies, to indicate to them the number of men they must furnish (Liv. 34.56.5-6). It is at the Capitol that the Senate generally deliberates about war, truces, or peace (App. *B.C.* 7.5; Liv. 33.25.7); and again at the Capitol that the consul, before leaving Rome to take command of his troops,

2. The excavations of 1919 completely uncovered the platform; see Lugli, *RA*, pp. 19-28; E. Gjerstad, *Early Rome* 3 (1960): 168-90 (architectural reconstruction; terra-cottas).

3. Above, pp. 189-91.

formulates the vows for the success of his arms—an affair which is always conducted, according to Livy, *cum magna dignitate et maiestate* (42.49.1). At the Capitol, by order of the Senate, the statue of a good citizen or an able commander is displayed.

The triumph, when the Senate accords it to a victorious general, is the most striking manifestation of the understanding between the god and the people. By his success, itself the fruit of his vow, the general has become Jupiter's debtor. He discharges his obligation at the head of his army. Leaving the Field of Mars, the procession reaches the Circus, and going around the Palatine, enters at the bottom of the Forum upon the Sacra Via which leads to the foot of the Capitol. For several hours the triumphant general is the human double of Jupiter. Following the classic arrangement of the ceremony, in which Greek elements were superimposed on an archaic Roman setting, he advances in a chariot, crowned with laurel, and in the apparel of the god,⁴ *Jouis O.M. ornatu decoratus*, his face tinged with red like that of the statue which awaits him in the sanctuary. He holds in his right hand a laurel branch, and in his left an ivory scepter topped with the figure of an eagle. Behind the Senate, forming a colorful cortege, the white animals destined for sacrifice, the spoils, and the distinguished prisoners precede him, while his soldiers follow him, singing songs of mixed praise and satire with the utmost freedom. At the foot of the Capitol he steps down, then climbs the slope, and entering the temple presents to the god the laurel which he has brought. For the whole Roman people, this day is an extraordinary experience, from which, as from a spring, they draw new reasons for hope and pride. Plutarch's account (*Aem. Paul.* 32–34) of one of the most famous triumphs, that of Aemilius Paulus after the victory of Pydna (168), gives an idea of the splendor and the spectacular heights of power to which this liturgy, enriched by the example of the Hellenistic pageant, might attain:

The people erected scaffoldings in the theatres for equestrian contests, which they call circuses, and round the forum, occupied the other parts of the city

4. Cf. Serv. Ecl. 10.27: *unde etiam triumphantes habent omnia insignia Jouis, sceptrum palmatam togam*. L. Deubner, "Die Tracht des römischen Triumphators," *Hermes* 69 (1934): 320, thought that the apparel of the triumphator was less that of the god than that of the ancient *rex*; Latte, p. 152, n. 3, justly objects that this cannot be true of the daubing with minium. Mrs. Larissa Warren-Bonfante is preparing a new interpretation of the triumphal garment, based on Etruscan archaeological documents.

which afforded a view of the procession, and witnessed the spectacle arrayed in white garments. Every temple was open and filled with garlands and incense, while numerous servitors and lictors restrained the thronging and scurrying crowds and kept the streets open and clear. Three days were assigned for the triumphal procession. The first barely sufficed for the exhibition of the captured statues, paintings, and colossal figures, which were carried on two hundred and fifty chariots. On the second, the finest and richest of the Macedonian arms were borne along in many waggons. The arms themselves glittered with freshly polished bronze and steel, and were carefully and artfully arranged to look exactly as though they had been piled together in heaps and at random, helmets lying upon shields and breast-plates upon greaves, while Cretan targets and Thracian wicker shields and quivers were mixed up with horses' bridles, and through them projected naked swords and long Macedonian spears planted among them, all the arms being so loosely packed that they smote against each other as they were borne along and gave out a harsh and dreadful sound, and the sight of them, even though they were spoils of a conquered enemy, was not without its terrors. After the waggons laden with armour there followed three thousand men carrying coined silver in seven hundred and fifty vessels, each of which contained three talents and was borne by four men, while still other men carried mixing-bowls of silver, drinking horns, bowls, and cups, all well arranged for show and excelling in size and in the depth of their carved ornaments.

On the third day, as soon as it was morning, trumpeters led the way, sounding out no marching or processional strain, but such a one as the Romans use to rouse themselves to battle. After these there were led along a hundred and twenty stall-fed oxen with gilded horns, bedecked with fillets and garlands. Those who led these victims to the sacrifice were young men wearing aprons with handsome borders, and boys attended them carrying gold and silver vessels of libation. Next, after these, came the carriers of the coined gold, which, like the silver, was portioned out into vessels containing three talents; and the number of these vessels was eighty lacking three. After these followed the bearers of the consecrated bowl, which Aemilius had caused to be made of ten talents of gold and adorned with precious stones, and then those who displayed the bowls known as Antigonids and Seleucids and Theracleian, together with all the gold plate of Perseus's table. These were followed by the chariot of Perseus, which bore his arms, and his diadem lying upon his arms. Then, at a little interval, came the children of the king, led along as slaves, and with them a throng of foster-parents, teachers, and tutors, all in tears, stretching out their own hand to the spectators and teaching the children to beg and supplicate. There were two boys, and one girl, and they were not very conscious of the magnitude of their evils because of their tender

age; wherefore they evoked even more pity in view of the time when their unconsciousness would cease, so that Perseus walked along almost unheeded, while the Romans, moved by compassion, kept their eyes upon the children, and many of them shed tears, and for all of them the pleasure of the spectacle was mingled with pain, until the children had passed by.

Behind the children and their train of attendants walked Perseus himself, clad in a dark robe and wearing the high boots of his country, but the magnitude of his evils made him resemble one who is utterly dumbfounded and bewildered. He, too, was followed by a company of friends and intimates, whose faces were heavy with grief, and whose tearful gaze continually fixed upon Perseus gave the spectators to understand that it was his misfortune which they bewailed, and that their own fate least of all concerned them. And yet Perseus had sent to Aemilius begging not to be led in the procession and asking to be left out of the triumph. But Aemilius, in mockery, as it would seem, of the king's cowardice and love of life, had said: "But this at least was in his power before, and is so now, if he should wish it," signifying death in preference to disgrace; for this, however, the coward had not the heart, but was made weak by no one knows what hopes, and became a part of his own spoils.

Next in order to these were carried wreaths of gold, four hundred in number, which the cities had sent with their embassies to Aemilius as prizes for his victory. Next, mounted on a chariot of magnificent adornment, came Aemilius himself, a man worthy to be looked upon even without such marks of power, wearing a purple robe interwoven with gold, and holding forth in his right hand a spray of laurel. The whole army also carried sprays of laurel, following the chariot of their general by companies and divisions, and singing, some of them divers songs intermingled with jesting, as the ancient custom was, and others paeans of victory and hymns in praise of the achievements of Aemilius, who was gazed upon and admired by all, and envied by no one that was good.

Thus the Capitoline god was truly Jupiter *praesens* among his people. Throughout Roman history his temple remained the political and religious citadel, as the other summit of the hill was the military citadel. *Joue incolumi* . . . : Rome knew itself to be safe for as long as the temple should exist or when it should be reborn from its ashes.

Jupiter was the sole master in his temple: it was to him that the vow and the dedication had been addressed. The two goddesses who dwelt beneath his roof were only his guests. There was no ceremony whose object was to honor or even to recall to mind the triad as

such, and the cultic formulas which expressly associate the three names in ancient times are not numerous. Seized by the *viator* and taken to prison, Livy's Manlius exclaims, "Jupiter Optimus Maximus, and Queen Juno and Minerva, and all ye other gods and goddesses that dwell in the Capitol and in the Citadel, is it thus ye suffer your soldier, and protector to be tormented by his adversaries?" (6.16.2). The same historian's Scipio, summoned to court by the tribunes, refuses to answer, and followed by the crowd and even by the clerks and bailiffs of the tribunal, mounts the hill to give thanks to the divinities who granted him victory over Hannibal: "I shall proceed at once from here to the Capitol to offer homage to Jupiter Optimus Maximus and Juno and Minerva and the other gods who preside over the Capitol and the citadel . . ." (38.51.9). But all this is in the fine Augustan style. One has the impression that it is only in the course of history that the two goddesses acquired some permanent stability on either side of the god; for a long time they had been confined merely to watching his dealings with men.

Nevertheless they are there, and the origin and the meaning of the triad constitute problems for which, in the present state of our knowledge, it is not possible to provide a final solution. Before we pose these problems, it is fitting to observe what each of the two goddesses represented in Roman theology, outside of the Capitoline grouping.

JUNO

Juno is the most important of Rome's goddesses, but also the most baffling.⁵ Queen of the Capitol since the earliest times of the Republic, she also presides over births, rules the Calends of each month, and, multiplied indefinitely as *Junones*, forms a feminine equivalent to the *Genius* of men. If she is observed outside of Rome—for her cult was an ancient one in central Italy, and she had been borrowed by the Etruscans, under the name of *Uni*—several of these characteristics see their authenticity confirmed, but others appear, notably a warlike mission and equipment.

5. I cannot agree with W. F. Otto, "Juno, Beiträge zum Verhältnisse der ältesten und wichtigsten Tatsachen ihres Kultes," *Philol.* n.s. 18 (1905): 161–223, or with E. L. Shields, *Juno, a Study in Early Roman Religion* (1926).

A series of attempts to put all this into a logical and chronological order has resulted in a construction whose fragility is apparent. It is more worthwhile to set forth the data in all their complexity, after we have put in their proper perspective a fact and a hypothesis from which excessive conclusions have been drawn.

The name, *Jūnō*, which formerly was explained as akin to the first part of *Juppiter*, supports only one etymology. It is a derivative in *-ōn-* from *iūn-*, a syncopated form which also occurs in *iūnix* "heifer" (beside *iuuencus* "bullock") and in the comparative *iūnior*. But this origin is not an adequate explanation of the word. The inflection *-ō -ōnis*, except for nouns in *-iō* (such as *legiō*, *nātiō*), is not very common in the feminine gender. On the other hand, the meaning of *iuuen-* is richer than was believed until recent times. In an admirable article (1938), E. Benveniste has shown that the Indo-European word is derived from the root which, in another form, was expanded into *aeuum* (Greek *αἰών*, etc.) and which closely concerns "the vital force."⁶ The *iuuen-* (*iuuenis*) is man at the moment when his vital force is at its peak. What then does *Jūnō* represent, in terms of this meaning, or what did she originally represent? The simple abstract idea of youth? The vital force or the impetuous spirit of young people? The young as an age group, as a division of society? It is not possible to decide, and the existence of a personified *Juventas*, probably more recent, does not simplify matters.⁷ To be sure, one may note that the word is exactly parallel to the Sabine proper name *Ner-ō*, and this circumstance is the more remarkable in that Umbrian *ner-*, in the ritual of Iguvium, is articulated in a formulary way with *iou-*, apparently contrasting mature and experienced warriors with the *iuniores* soldiers.⁸ But the name is still too obscure to provide a basis for study.

One of the foundations of the usual interpretation is the assumption that Juno began by being only the feminine equivalent of Genius. From the earliest times each woman is supposed to have had, under this name, her guardian spirit, or simply her double, her essence, the expression of her fertile nature; and it is only by an effort of ab-

6. "Expression indo-européenne de l'éternité," *BSL* 38 (1937): 103-12.

7. See above, pp. 200-202.

8. "*ner-* et *uiro-* dans les langues italiques," *REL* 31 (1953): 185; reprinted, with some modification, in *IR*, pt. II, chap. 6.

straction that a great goddess should have been disengaged from the swarm of individual *Junones*. This process, which has also been supposed for other divinities, has no basis in the facts and is not, by itself, likely. For example, was a god named *Genius* ever disengaged from the multiple *Genii*? Above all, however, it is not probable that in ancient times *Juno* had the use that is attributed to her. While the *Genius* of masculine characters appears in the comedies of Plautus, there is no evidence of a *Juno* of women, and we must wait for Tibullus to find any mention of her in literature (3.19.15 and 3.6.48—from which moreover we might also deduce that each woman has a *Venus*). As proof of a greater antiquity, it has been alleged (most recently by Latte, p. 105) that in the ritual of the *Fratres Arvales* a *Juno Deae Diae* receives two ewes at the side of *Dea Dia* herself, who receives two cows. But this ritual dates from the imperial era, and in spite of its general archaism, the possibility cannot be excluded that it underwent modernizing retouchings in the period when Augustus restored the sodality and its ceremonies, which had practically disappeared (Wiss., p. 561, n. 7; Latte, p. 54; etc.), and it is uncontested that, in the Augustan era, the *Juno* of women was the counterpart of the *Genius* of men. The parallel furnished by an inscription of the republican era (*CIL*, IX, 3513;⁹ 58 B.C.) is appropriately cited in this discussion: in the sacred wood of Jupiter Liber, at Furfo, a “*res deiuna*” is envisaged both for this god and for his *Genius*, *Genius Jouis Liberi*. Cases of this kind may in fact have served as masculine models for a retouching or for an addition at the time when the ritual of the *Fratres Arvales* was restored. But nobody seems to have noticed that in the second, later, inscription, in which there is the question not only of the *Genius Jouis*, but also of the *Genius Martis* (*CIL*, II, 2407), a feminine divinity, *Victoria* is likewise provided with such a double. However, this double is called *Genius Victoriae*, and not **Juno Victoriae*.¹⁰ The other arguments are no better. The oath of women, *eiuno*, which is supposed to be parallel to the old oath of men by their *Genius*, is ignored in Plautus and in all the literature, and is mentioned only by a grammarian of the fourth century: it proves nothing in regard to the time of the Republic. The attribution, according to Varro (*L.L.* 5.69), which women made of their eyebrows

9. Degrassi, *ILLR*, no. 508, II, 6–8.

10. Shortly after *genio Victoriae*, the inscription has *genio meo*.

to the goddess Juno (and not to "their" Juno), or, according to Paulus Diaconus (p. 403 L²), the *tutela* which Juno keeps over eyebrows (without distinction of sex) is not of the same nature as the connection of each man's Genius with his forehead (Serv. *Aen.* 3.607; *Ecl.* 6.3).¹¹

Thus an objective inventory of Juno's functions remains the surest approach. Here are those which seem, at Rome, to be native and preliterate.

As Lucina, she leads the newborn to the light of day, is invoked for confinements (Plaut. *Truc.* 476), and receives the resulting offerings (Tert. *An.* 39; *Schol. Bern. in Verg. Ecl.* 4.62).¹² On the northern brow of the Esquiline a temple is erected *Junonis Lucinae*, dedicated in 375 in a wood already consecrated to the goddess. By an easily understood symbolism, nobody is admitted there if he has a knot in his clothing. The annalistic tradition anachronistically attributed to Servius Tullius a law enacted for statistical purposes, which obliged the parents of every newborn child to deposit a piece of money in this temple's treasury (Dion. 4.15.5).

Juno patronizes several festivals which have a certain connection with the fecundity of women and with femininity in general. On 7 July the oldest ferial registers the *Nonae Caprotinae*, in which the free women and the *ancillae* take part. The latter amuse themselves by racing and also by fighting with fists and stones. The sacrifice takes place under a wild fig tree, *caprificus*, and the "milk" which flows from one of its branches (Varr. *L.L.* 6.18; Macr. 1.11.36; etc.) is used in the rites. Juno herself received the name *Caprotina*. In this connection we recall that the thongs with which on 17 February the Luperci strike the Roman ladies to guarantee their fertility are made from the skin of a he-goat, *caper*, called the *amiculum Junonis*. Fig tree, he-goat: both animal and plant contribute a great deal of sexual symbolism.

The less lively Matronalia of the Calends of March, which Juvenal (9.53) calls *femineae Kalendae*, and which are the *dies natalis* of the Esquiline temple, concern only matrons. The explanations of the festival are based either on an all-important birth, that of Romulus (Ov. *F.* 3.233), or on the springtime awakening of universal

11. The two contexts of Servius prove moreover that the conception is not old.

12. Above, pp. 33-34, the minor entities which seem to constitute the *indigitationes* of Juno.

fecundity, *tempora fecunda* (ibid. 235-44). The *lucus* of the Esquiline, the place of worship, is connected with the account of the first and difficult pregnancy of the Sabine women after their rape (ibid. 2.425-52, especially 435, 449, 451), just as the day of the festival is related to the account of their intervention as *oratrices pacis* between their fathers and their husbands (ibid. 3.179-252). On this day, to provide for their own ritual gifts, the women receive money from their husbands, who pray *pro conseruatione coniugii* (ps.-Acro in Hor. *Carm.* 3.8.1; Suet. *Vesp.* 19.1; Plaut. *Mil.* 692-700).

The dedication of the Esquiline temple on the Calends of March is a privileged case of a more general rule. All of Juno's foundations are connected with the Calends, because the Calends were consecrated to her: *ut autem Idus omnes Ioui, ita omnes Kalendas Junoni tributas et Varronis et pontificalis adfirmat auctoritas*, says Macrobius (1.15.18), who adds that this usage was confirmed by that of the Laurentines, who made their supplications to the goddess on all the Calends, from March to December, and called her on this occasion *Kalendaris Juno*. As for the Romans, he says, on all the Calends a *pontifex minor* sacrifices to Juno (the editors often make the unnecessary correction: to Janus) in the *curia Calabra*, while in the Regia the wife of the *rex sacrorum* immolates a sow or a ewe lamb; whence the onomastic formula "*Janus Junonius*," *quod illi deo omnis ingressus, huic deae cuncti Kalendarum dies uidentur ascripti*. It is easy to see the connection between this specialty of Juno and her role as Lucina. The goddess of childbirth presides also over the beginning of the month, the "rebirth" of the moon. A "beginning" may be equally well understood in terms of a birth (Juno) or in terms of a transition (Janus). This interpretation is supported by the fact that, speaking from the *curia Calabra*, after the sacrifice, the pontiff announces on which day the next nones will fall, either the fifth or the seventh, depending on the month. He does this by means of a formula which is addressed to *Juno Couella* (Varr. *L.L.* 6.27). The epithet is obscure, but the act has meaning only if the ritual entrusts to Juno the "growing" of the moon in the succeeding days.¹³

13. Some ingenious ideas are expressed in M. Renard, "Juno Couella," *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Byzantines et Slaves* 12 (1952): 401-8; by the same author: "Le nom de Junon," *Phoibos* 5 (*Hommages à J. Hombert*) (1950-51): 141-43; "Juno Historia," *Lat.* 12 (1953): 137-54; "Aspects anciens de Janus et de Junon," *RBPhH* 31 (1953): 5-21. The explanation of *Couella* by *caua luna*, which Latte supports, p. 43, n. 2, is not very likely.

To this coherent group of services another group is juxtaposed, politico-religious in nature, which cannot be explained without artifice as derived from the former. Unfortunately, the first element of this group is uncertain. Several texts speak of a cult which, in each *curia*, should receive *Juno Curitis*. This word is written in various ways, and each of the spellings is based on a different etymology: *Quiritis* (*Quirites*), *Curritis* (*currus*), *Curitis* (either Sabine *curis* "spear" or *curia*). Thus it is possible that *Juno* was associated with the *curiae* only through a play on words. In any case, the cult is not directly attested, and perhaps the only *Juno Curitis* in Rome was the one who was introduced there in 241, after the capture of Falerii.

By contrast, on the Capitol *Juno* is certainly *Regina*, and this is not a title which could be given or accepted lightly by the Italic peoples, particularly by the first generations of the Roman *libertas*. Moreover, it is the *regina sacrorum* who offers the sacrifice of the Calends to *Juno*. Since the goddess in this definitely ancient ritual is envisaged, as we have seen, as "causing the month to be born," the participation of the *regina* suggests that before the Republic and the Capitoline cult, even in her role as mother, *Juno* had some connection with royalty.

Even though we cannot always determine what is pre-Roman and what is dependent on the Roman model, before we evaluate this balance sheet we must also observe the usage of the neighboring peoples, primarily the Latins, among whom *Juno* was highly honored. Five Latin cities (*Aricia*, *Lanuvium*, "populus Laurens," *Praeneste*, and *Tibur*, *Ov. F.* 6.59-62) gave her name to a month. *Tusculum* and *Norba* knew her as *Lucina*, and the poets make her an important goddess of *Gabii*, a city which vanished early. Moreover, she was *Curitis* at *Tibur* and *Falerii*, and in the fact that her cult there, during the Empire, was assured by a masculine priest, *pontifex sacrarius*, there has been seen the proof that she took an interest in the whole of society. Two concordant characteristics of her cult are to be noted. Several glosses of *Servius*, unfortunately spoiled by the usual etymological plays on this name, show that the *Juno Curitis* of *Tibur* was an armed protectress: "In the ceremonies of *Tibur*, the following prayer is made: *Juno Curitis*, with your chariot (*curru*) and your buckler

protect my young slaves of the curia (*curiae*) (?) born in the house!"¹⁴ (Serv. *Aen.* 1.17); she makes use of *curru et hasta* (ibid. 1.8), and intervenes in wars (ibid. 2.612); according to Martianus Capella (2.149), *Curitim debent memorare bellantes*.

To judge from the charming description of her festival which Ovid gives (*Am.* 3.13), the Juno of Falerii is entirely peaceful, save toward the goat. But a warlike nature is strongly indicated in the Juno of Lanuvium, although here it seems to be inserted into a complex structure, to which an interesting nomenclature bears witness. Pictorial representations fully confirm the sentence in which Cicero, or rather Cotta, his character in the *De natura deorum* (1.82), illustrating the variety of divine *simulacra* worshiped by various peoples, has his interlocutor remark that the bull Apis is no less a god for the Egyptians than "You believe the Juno Sospita of your native place to be a goddess. You never see her even in your dreams unless equipped with goat-skin, spear,¹⁵ buckler and slippers turned up at the toe." Either on foot, aggressive, or riding in a chariot at the gallop, her spear advanced, holding on her left arm a buckler with in-curving edges analogous to that of the Salii, the type of goddess depicted in statues or on coins is clearly and uniquely warlike. But the Juno of Lanuvium is not solely *seispes*. Several dedications occurring in volume 14 of the *Corpus* are addressed I(VNONI) S.M.R. (2091; 2088; 2089; 2121), that is, as it is written in full in one of them (2090, of the first century B.C.), I(VNONE SEISPITEI MATRI REGINAE "Junoni Seispiti Matri Reginae." Such triple qualification is exceptional in Italy, and signifies an accumulation of functions or aspects which is equivalent to a theological definition. Each of these aspects is clear in itself.¹⁶

The title of *Regina*, which has already been indicated at Rome, presents Juno as a politico-religious mistress. This explains why the highest magistrate of Lanuvium, the dictator, who appoints her flamen (Cic. *Mil.* 17.45), and why Rome's top officials, *omnes consules*, after the deferential condominium over the Lanuvian goddess which Rome arrogated in 388 (Liv. 8.14.2), are bound to sacrifice to her (Cic. *Mur.* 41.90).

14. It is excessive to draw conclusions from this gloss, in which *curia* is an etymological pun, about "eine archaische Struktur der Gesellschaft in Tibur." Latte, p. 105, n. 2 to the end (p. 106).

15. Elsewhere this spear behaves like the spear of Mars. Liv. 21.62.4; above, pp. 23-25.

16. I sum up here my article "Juno S.M.R.," *Eranos* 52 (1954): 105-19.

Placed as it is in second position, the word *Mater* cannot be simply the lofty honorary title which it or its masculine equivalent is in such expressions as Mars Pater or Vesta Mater; it has to have its full meaning, and it reminds us that the feasts of the Roman Lucina are called *Matronalia*: fertility feasts for the participation of women who are both wives and mothers. It is perhaps with this "fecundity" aspect that the famous serpent of the Juno of Lanuvium is connected, along with the corresponding rites (Prop. 4.8.3-14; Aelian. *Anim.* 11.16).

The meaning of the first adjective, *Seispes*, transferred to Rome under the form *Sospita*, is not clear but it is with this, as well as with *Curitis*, that the Romans—and there is no reason to believe that they had modified the usage of the Lanuvians in this—especially identified the warrior quality of the goddess: *illam uestram Sospitam, quam tu nunquam, ne in somnis quidem, uides nisi cum hasta, cum scutulo . . .*

It is immediately apparent that Juno thus finds herself qualified in all three functions of the old Indo-European ideology: in the area of warlike power, in the area of fecundity, and in the area of sacred royalty. And she is qualified in a formulary way, through a nomenclature which guarantees that her priests and her worshipers knew her and wished her to be trivalent.¹⁷

Did this theology appear in other Latin or Italic cities? Nowhere does one find the equivalent of the Lanuvian S.M.R. To be sure, throughout Italy Juno receives titles which recall her various meanings at Rome and Lanuvium. She is *Lucina* at Pisaurum in Umbria and at several places in Campania; *Populona* (whatever the meaning, in this word, of *populus* may be: "army," according to Latte; or "political unit") at Teanum in Campania; *Regina* at Terventum in Samnium, perhaps at Ardea in Latium, and definitely and especially at Veii in Etruria. At Veii, at the beginning of the fourth century, she furnished the Romans and Camillus with the most famous occasion for *euocatio*, after which she was installed, under this name and with her xoanon, in the temple on the Aventine. She was *Regina Matrona* at Pisaurum, and *Regina Populona* at Aesernia in Samnium. But as we can see, these groupings are only binary.

17. Is the *Juno Martialis* who appears on imperial coins of the third century the late official leveling of a local cult (Umbria, Etruria)? See J. Heurgon, *SE* 24 (1955-56): 93, and J. Gagé, *Matronalia* (1963), pp. 55, n. 2, and 275-76.

In general, only the Juno of the feminine cults is willingly admitted to be primitive, and her other aspects are explained either by spontaneous development or by foreign influences, Greek or Greco-Etruscan. Latte writes (p. 168):

The development of the figure of Juno can be understood if one admits that, as the goddess of women, she was originally invoked for the multiplication of the population, and at the same time for the military strength of the community. The Samnite Populona can be understood in these terms. When her cult was adopted by the Etruscans, she became simply a city-goddess, coalescing with Athena Polias, which they likewise adopted, into a single figure. Subsequently she returned to the Latins and the cults of Lanuvium and Tibur with a plastic image, for the reason that Etruscan art was then providing the models for cultic representations.

These metamorphoses are simple and probable only on paper. One would like to know at least one other case in which the patronage of feminine fertility evolved in this way into military ardor and political patronage. On the other hand, we must not exaggerate the influence of pictorial borrowings. The fact that the portrayals of the Juno of Lanuvium show a warrior-goddess clothed and shod in Etruscan style does not prove that her warlike aspect, like her apparel and footwear, comes from Etruria. The Lanuvians may have possessed a warlike, indeed a national Juno, and have realized her, when they undertook to portray her, in terms of the only models then available to them. In Etruria itself, if the Italic Juno borrowed as *Uni* was already *Regina*, we may understand that she became a *Stadtgöttin*, a city-goddess (if she truly did become that), and, above all, that she was assimilated to Hera and paired with Tinia-Zeus. It is less easy to imagine this conception on the basis of a mere "Juno of women." Finally, *Regina* is an ancient Italic title, and it is arbitrary to regard it as a translation from the Etruscan.

Other authors, attempting a similar reduction of the primitive Juno of Rome itself to the role of "divinity of women," attribute the rest to direct Greek influence. According to them, a polyvalent Hera came from the south of Magna Graecia—"fecund, warlike, and political"—"a neighbor of the armed Heras of Argos and Elis." Despite J. Bayet's ability,¹⁸ this origin and this geographical

18. *Les origines de l'Hercule romain* (1926), pp. 75, 115, 170-71 (and n. 1), based on G. Giannelli, *Culti e miti della Magna Graecia* (1924).

progression remain unverifiable hypotheses, which have against them the fact that they leave practically nothing original in a goddess who is after all definitely Italic and, as far back as we can trace her, important.

I myself have proposed a solution, which is naturally also hypothetical but which does not encounter any of the difficulties which argue against the others. I maintain that the diverse aspects of Juno—two at Rome, *Lucina* (etc.) and *Regina*, three at Lanuvium—are fundamentally irreducible, and it is their very association in one person which characterizes the goddess. Juno did not develop from an original *Lucina* or *Mater* into a simple *Regina* or a *Seispes* plus *Regina*. From the beginning she was multivalent, bivalent here, trivalent there, but by necessity and tradition multivalent. This conception follows naturally from the interpretation of the primitive Jupiter-Mars-Quirinus triad as the survival at Rome of an Indo-European grouping based on the ideology of the three functions.

In fact, among the Germans as well as the Indo-Iranians, we can observe the following structure. As a counterbalance to the group of masculine gods, each of whom embodies distinctively and analytically one and only one of the three basic functions, there is a goddess who synthesizes these functions, who assumes and reconciles all three, and who constitutes the very ideal of woman in society. Indeed, through her name or through her dominant characteristic, this goddess has a particular foundation in one of the three functions (usually the third), but she is nonetheless competent and active in the other two. The *ṚgVeda* entrusts this role to the river goddess Sarasvatī, who is originally established, through her quality as a river, in the third function.¹⁹ The provider of vitality and posterity (RV 2.41.17), she is associated with the canonical gods of the third function, the *Ásvin* (10.131.5—and still more in the rituals), with the divinities of procreation, the specialized *Sinivalī*, and again with the *Ásvin* (10.184.2: *gárbhaṃ dhehi* “implant the embryo!” she is told). Her inexhaustible breasts provide nourishment of all sorts (1.164.49). In short, she is the “mother,” and is even named with three superlatives *ámbitame nádítame dévitame Sárasvati*, “S. the mother, the river,

19. *Tarpeia* (1947), pp. 56–66 (“Sarasvatī, Anāhitā, Ārmaiti”); the Sarasvatī-Anāhitā correspondence was independently rediscovered by H. Lommel, *Festschrift für F. Weller* (1954), pp. 405–13.

the goddess par excellence" (2.41.16). She is the giver of posterity (*prajā*), on which rest all the ages of life (or all the vital forces: *viśvā dyumṣi*, *ibid.* 17). But at the same time she is active on the first level, the emphasis in this literature being placed on the strictly religious, sacred, and nonpolitical aspect of this level. She is pure (1.3.10), and she is the means of purification; she forms a triad with the two specialized goddesses of the offering, *Idā* and *Bharatī*; she "leads our pious thoughts to their conclusion" (2.3.8); she is "the helper of pious thoughts" (7.61.4), and literally "reigns [*vī rājati*] over all pious thoughts" (1.3.10-11). Finally, she is also a warrior: allied with the Marut, she bravely destroys her enemies (2.30.8), and, alone among the feminine goddesses, she bears the epithet which characterizes the warrior-god Indra, *vṛtraghnī* "destroyer of oppositions, victorious one" (6.61.7). In the transposition of a pre-Vedic mythology into epic poetry, and of divine personages into heroic characters, discovered by S. Wikander in 1947 in the great Indian poem the *Mahābhārata*,²⁰ this theologem was put into a very picturesque and very clever form. The principal masculine characters of the poem, presented as the sons of the Indo-Iranian functional gods, are half-brothers whose characters and modes of action coincide with those of their fathers, and whose order of birth reproduces the hierarchical order of these fathers. The eldest is a pious and just king (the son of Dharma, a rejuvenated form of Mitra); the next two are warriors, one brutal and armed with a club (the son of Vāyu), the other chivalrous and skilled with missile weapons (the son of Indra); the last two are twins (the sons of the twin Aśvin), and a characteristic episode portrays them as specialists in the rearing of animals, one of horses, the other of cattle. This harmonious team of five differentiated men has only one single wife, whom they all share in common, and who is the epic transmutation of the omnivalent goddess of the myths and, at the same time, the model of Indian women.

In the Vedic hymns and rituals, this triple nature of the goddess is not expressed by three conjoined epithets,²¹ any more than in the Latin cities other than Lanuvium. But the corresponding goddess

20. "Pāṇḍavasagan och Mahābhāratas mytiska förtutsättningar," *Religion och Bibel* 6 (1947): 27-39; translated in my *JMQ* 4 (1948): 37-53; cf. *ibid.*, pp. 75-76; see now *ME* 1: 103-24.

21. But Sarasvatī is called *triṣṭadsthā* "having a threefold place," *RV* 6.61.12.

of the Iranians, in whom by general agreement there is seen a very faithful renewal of the Indo-Iranian Sarasvatī, fills this gap. In the *Avesta*, the famous Anāhitā, who is essentially a great mythical river, has in fact the same three powers as the Vedic Sarasvatī. According to her *Yast*, she is invoked by the warriors, by the priests, and by expectant mothers (*Yt.* 5.85–87); and in fact she causes females to give birth successfully and makes their milk flow regularly at the proper time (*ibid.* 1–2, etc.); she provides the heroes of history with strength so that they may vanquish their demoniac enemies (*ibid.* 16–83); and moreover, she is the great purifier, and to her in particular is applied the expression *yaož dā* “to put in condition ritually, to purify” (*Yasna* 65.2 and 5; *Yt.* 5.5; *Vid.* 7.16). Thus the full name of the goddess is also triple, and Anāhitā is only its third term. She is called “the Moist [*Arədvī*], the Strong [*Sūrā*], the Immaculate [*Anāhitā*],” thus proclaiming her triple nature and providing a valuable parallel to the threefold title *Juno Seispes Mater Regina*, which merely shows another politico-religious orientation of the “first function.”

Among the Germans, the homologous goddess was bivalent, or at any rate the “second function” was not in evidence in her, annexed as it was, among these people, to the first. The goddess **Friy(y)ō*—was at the same time the sovereign, the wife of the great god (*Frea* in the legend which explains the name of the Lombards) and “Venus” (whence the translation **Friy(y)a-dagaz* “Friday, Veneris dies, vendredi”). But the inner tension of this personage was so strong that the best known of the Germanic mythologies, the Scandinavian, caused her to split in two, and made a double divinity of her.²² Frigg (the normal development from **Friyyō*) remained purely sovereign, still only the wife of the magician-king Óðinn; on the other hand, from the name of Freyr, the canonical god of the third function, a second figure was created, that of Freyja, who was herself reduced to the third function, as a typical Vanic goddess, rich and pleasure-loving.

Did not the various theologies of Latium quite simply preserve this kind of goddess? At Lanuvium she appears complete, active in all three functions, but at Rome as among the Continental Germans she is confined to the two extreme functions of sovereignty and fecundity. Her character as *Regina*, acknowledged to have the same primordial

22. “Le trio des Macha,” *RHR* 146 (1954): 16, n. 2 = *ME* I: 611 n. 1.

claims as the others, explains how in the system of *interpretationes* Juno (Uni) was translated as Hera, thus assuring herself of a brilliant future, while at the same time she remained Lucina, and, in those places where she served in a warlike capacity, retained that character as well.

MINERVA

The picture presented by the Capitoline companion of Juno Regina is entirely different, almost reversed. The Roman Minerva may be summed up in a word: she is the goddess of arts and trades and of those who practice them. In Italy, outside of Falerii and Etruria, her cult is scantily attested. And in the end her identification with the Greek Athena had greater consequences than that of Juno with Hera.

The name may be Italic, and may derive from the Indo-European root **men-*, which connotes all the activities of the mind. *Minerua dicta, quod bene moneat*, we read in Paulus Diaconus (p. 249 L²), and Festus (p. 312 L²) notes in the *carmen Saliare* a verb *promeneruat*, meaning *monet*, which, in the sense of "instruct," is in complete accordance with the one service which she performs. But the derivation is strange in Latin,²³ and an Etruscan origin is often suggested.

The early calendars do not indicate a feast for Minerva, but the day which is called, in the feminine plural, *Quinquatrus*, the fifth after the Ides of March, the nineteenth, saw her honored by her people, who were the artisans of every variety.²⁴ This was the *artificum dies*, says the calendar of Praeneste, and Ovid gives a very lively description of what took place then (F. 3.815-32).

Ye boys and tender girls, pray now to Pallas; he who shall have won the favour of Pallas will be learned. When once they have won the favour of Pallas, let girls learn to card the wool and to unload the full distaffs. She also teaches how to traverse the upright warp with the shuttle, and she drives home the loose threads with the comb. Worship her, thou who dost remove stains from damaged garments; worship her, thou who dost make ready the brazen cauldrons for the fleeces. If Pallas frown, no man shall make shoes

23. A. Meillet, *De i.-e. radice *men- "mente agitare,"* (1897), p. 48, already rejected this etymology.

24. The *tibicines*, who were important in the cult, had a special day called *Quinquatrus minuscule*, on 13 June. Ov. F. 6.651-52.

well, though he were more skilful than Tychius; and though he were more adroit with his hands than Epeus of old, yet shall he be helpless, if Pallas be angry with him. Ye too, who banish sicknesses by Phoebus' art, bring from your earnings a few gifts to the goddess. And spurn her not, ye schoolmasters, ye tribe too often cheated of your income, she attracts new pupils; and thou who dost ply the graving tool and paint pictures in encaustic colors, and thou who dost mould the stone with deft hand (spurn not the goddess). She is the goddess of a thousand works.

With this simple theology, can Minerva be truly Roman? In general, the opposite is maintained, but the principal argument which is advanced, the absence of the goddess from the early ferial, is not decisive. It merely suggests that in primitive Rome the artisans were not a differentiated class of men, any more than they were in Vedic India, for example. The arts existed. The words which in Rome designate the modeling of clay, weaving, and the activity of the wheelwright are Indo-European, a fact which implies transmitted knowledge, skills. But these activities were probably practiced in private, within each family; the Minerva, the "teacher," if she then existed, had no place in public worship. Therefore, we must not rule out the possibility that the goddess was native to both Rome and Falerii, but that the Faliscans, exposed at an earlier date and more completely to the influence and prestige of Etruscan techniques, were the first to confirm her as the patroness of these techniques, which were thenceforth practiced by numerous specialists, thus making possible her later appropriation by their Roman rivals.

In addition to her lodgment in one of the three *cellae* in the Capitoline temple, Minerva had two sanctuaries: a temple on the Aventine, which is first mentioned at the time of the Second Punic War but is certainly older; and a chapel on the Caelian Hill, which Varro (*L.L.* 5.47) calls *Minervium* and which contained a statue brought from Falerii after the capture of that city in 241: whence the curious name of *sacellum Mineruae Captae*. This is the only cultic name which Minerva receives. As we can see, it alludes only to a historical event, and tells us nothing about her nature.

At Falerii itself, was Minerva more than a goddess of the arts and of artisans? In an inscription of the second half of the second century before Christ (*CIL*, XI, 3081 = I², 365; Vetter, no. 320), a praetor with the Etruscan name of Lars Cotena, the son of Lars, says that he has

fulfilled a vow to *Menerua*, *de xenatuo sententiad*. Judging by the rank of the donor and the intervention of the Senate, some have claimed that at Falerii Minerva was the "city-goddess" (Latte, p. 164), but how can we tell? The inscription does not indicate the reasons for the vow, and one may suppose more than one motive for public thanksgiving without leaving the limited domain of the Roman goddess. Nor can we deduce this character of "city-goddess" from the appropriation of Minerva by the conquering Romans. They did not "invite" her to come to Rome, like the divinities who had *tutela* over enemy cities; they "captured," or at least "took" her, which rules out the *evocatio*.

The only extension to be observed—very early in Etruria, more slowly in Rome—results from the *interpretatio* of Minerva as Pallas Athena. This equivalence may have been based originally on the known patronage by the two goddesses of the arts and trades (*Ἀθηνᾶ Ἐργάνη*), but, following the ordinary process, by way of this specific and limited contact, it is the whole Athena, in all her aspects, who is translated as *Menrua*, *Minerua*. In the scenes of Greek legend portrayed by Etruscan art, *Menrua*, usually in arms, is simply the Athena of the poets. It is impossible to know how far this assimilation actually modified and militarized the goddess. It will be recalled that on the *cista* of Praeneste, probably inspired by Etruscan conceptions, a scene that is not Greek shows a warlike Minerva bizarrely involved with a no less warlike Mars.

At Rome, the Hellenization of Minerva is made plain at the great lectisternium of 217, where she is served together with Neptune, here evidently conceived as Poseidon (Liv. 22.10.9). Ennius lists her among the twelve great gods, and all the poets and orators follow his lead. But we must wait for the time of Pompey to see her worshiped as Athena Nike, and the beneficiary of a foundation *de manubiis*, that is, made with the help of funds derived from the sale of booty (Plin. *N.H.* 7.97). When Livy names Minerva along with Mars and Lua Mater among the divinities in whose honor it was proper to burn the spoils of the enemy on the battlefield, one may say with some assurance that her name here is only an approximation for Nerio. Even in the fabliau which Ovid tells concerning the feast of Anna Perenna, on 15 March, and in spite of his expression (*armifer armiferae correptus amore Mineruae*, *F.* 3.681), the relations between the god and the

goddess are not those of two warriors. The comic intervention in her behalf of the aged Anna of Bovillae, five days before the *Quinquatrus*, rather places Minerva on the side of the plebs and against the patrician ruffian Mars.²⁵ The growing popularity of the Trojan legends, and the belief resulting from them that the *penus Vestae* harbored a Palladium among other pledges of empire (Cic. *Scaur.* 48) did not produce any rite.

Such in summary is the line of evolution of the Roman Minerva. But what did she represent in the Capitoline foundation, by the side of Jupiter and Juno? There is no ancient figuration, any more than for Juno, to orient research. The very simplicity of her file obscures the question, for despite the great achievements in the arts and crafts under the Etruscan kings, it is hard to believe that it was this specialty which qualified her for such an honor.

THE CAPITOLINE TRIAD

Where does the Capitoline triad come from? What does it signify? We must now return to these questions, not in order to resolve them, but to define their uncertainties and the reasons for those uncertainties.

It seems to be out of the question that the triad represents an old Latin establishment. The invention *a posteriori* of a *Capitolium uetus*, which is supposed to have united Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva on the Quirinal, was probably only a device for giving the foreign work the appearance of age and a national quality (Latte, p. 150, n. 3).²⁶

A direct cultic influence from Greece is not likely. The grouping *Ζεύς, Ἥρα, Ἀθηνᾶ* is indicated only once in the whole Greek world, in Phocis, actually under conditions remarkably analogous to those of the Capitoline cult (Paus. 10.5.1-2):

... Turning back from Daulis to the straight road to Delphi and going forwards, you see on the left of the road a building called the Phocian Building

25. Perhaps the same meaning may apply to the repugnance to war and to gladiatorial combats which marks the day of Minerva's "birth" (19 March). Ov. *F.* 3.812: *sanguine prima [dies] uacat nec fas concurrere ferro* (as contrasted with the following days).

26. It has also been thought that this "Capitolium vetus" may have been a provisional sanctuary which fulfilled the Etruscan vow at small cost, while the difficult completion of the Capitoline sanctuary was being awaited.

[τὸ Φωκικόν], where assemble the Phocian delegates from each city. The building is large, and within are pillars standing throughout its length. From the pillars rise steps to each wall, on which steps the Phocian delegates take their seats. At the end are neither pillars nor steps, but images of Zeus, Athena and Hera. That of Zeus is on a throne; on his right stands Hera, on his left Athena.

Supposing that this model existed at the end of the fifth century B.C., how could it have become known at Rome at such an early date?

On the other hand, if it is natural to imagine an Etruscan origin,²⁷ the uncertainty arises when one tries to specify this origin. Was the Capitoline grouping freely conceived among those of the Etruscans who dominated Rome, or had it had a previous existence in Etruria, and did "the Tarquins" merely apply a prefabricated pattern to their city? The first hypothesis is naturally not susceptible to direct verification. As for the second, the Roman scholars have given us only a few pieces of information tending to present the Capitoline triad as common property of the whole of Etruria, and lacking cross-checks, lacking native documents on Etruscan theology, it is impossible to evaluate them. According to Servius, *Aen.* 1.422, the scholars of that country, *prudentes Etruscae disciplinae*, said, in connection with the founding of cities, that only those cities were considered *iustae* in which three gates, three streets, and three temples were dedicated to Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva. Thus the Tarquins, in their temple with three *cellae*, should have made another application of the same principle. In his recommendations for the choice of proper places for various public buildings, Vitruvius (1.7)²⁸ says expressly that he takes his information from the writings of the Etruscan haruspices; he then prescribes that the temples of Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva be built *in excelsissimo loco*, separating these three gods from the mass of others. But who are these *prudentes*, and which are these books of the haruspices? A great many Etruscans, including both haruspices and scholars, were settled in Rome at a very early date, and flourished there. How could they have succeeded, how could they have responded to the changing needs of reality, if they had not adjusted their knowledge to the time and place? Only their methods and principles

27. A Sabine origin, which has also been proposed, is unfounded. Latte, p. 151, has serious reservations about the Etruscan origin.

28. See the translation of this text below, p. 670.

were doubtless traditional, and based on a fund of immutable doctrine. The text of Vitruvius confirms this presumption. Next to the rule relating to the temples of the three great divinities, he recommends that the temple of Mercury be placed either in the Forum or, "like those of Isis and Serapis," in the emporium; those of Apollo and Pater Liber near the theater; and those of Mars, Vulcan, and Venus outside the walls. Here is a wholly rejuvenated pantheon, which the old, strictly Etruscan science had certainly not foreseen. Nevertheless, the mention by both Servius and Vitruvius of separate temples, and also the mention by Servius of streets and gates, which do not correspond exactly to the situation at Rome, may indicate a doctrine independent of that situation.²⁹

As for the meaning which the Tarquins gave to the triad, either of their own accord or by tradition, it escapes us so much the more because we know their work only through a distorting screen. The vowing of the temple is to be credited to them, but they were ousted, either before the dedication or, if Raymond Bloch is right, immediately afterward, and it was the free Romans, the aristocracy hostile to their one-time masters, who administered the foundation from this very beginning. Indeed, in the earliest times, this foundation was at the heart of the open struggle between the two nations. Legend recounts more than one act, either before the task of building, or after its completion, expressing the rivalry of Rome (treated fictively as Latin, even under the Tarquins) and Etruria. Such is the omen of the *caput* which, without the betrayal by the son of Olenus Calenus, the Etruscan diviner of portents, would have granted to Etruria what was promised by the gods, that is, the domination of Italy (Plin. *N.H.* 28.15-16, etc.). Such too is the omen of the quadriga of Veii. When Tarquin the Proud was in exile in Etruria, stirring up a new war against Rome, a great prodigy occurred. While he was still king, he had ordered from the artists of Veii a quadriga of terra-cotta, to be placed on top of the temple. When the model of the work was put in the kiln, instead of shrinking through evaporation it swelled and broke its container. The haruspices declared that this portent augured happiness and power for the people who should possess the object,

29. In the Umbrian ritual of Iguvium, sacrifices are made distributively close to three gates to the three gods corresponding to the Roman Jupiter, Mars, and Quirinus. For another text (Serv. II, *Aen.* 1.42) in which an Etruscan attestation of the Capitoline triad has been sought, see below, p. 643, n. 33; cf. also p. 665, on Serv. *Aen.* 1.422, and p. 685, n. 139.

and the Veians resolved not to turn it over to the Romans, saying that it belonged to Tarquin and not to those who had banished him. But soon afterward, at the end of a chariot race which had taken place at Veii, the winner's horses bolted and ran without stopping to Rome, throwing their driver, Ratumena, near the gate which later bore his name. Frightened by this event, the Veians allowed the artisans to send the quadriga to the Romans (Plut. *Public.* 13; etc.). Even if one pays no heed to these legends, one may be sure that the Latin liberators, though they respected the Capitoline triad—how could they have disregarded a vow, and how could they have destroyed the cults resulting from that vow?—still controlled its spirit, and removed the traces of Etruscan influence as far as possible. In other words, the Capitoline theology was not the result of one single enterprise, but of two, an action and a reaction, the second of which corrected and obscured the first. In fact, taking the three divinities, especially Minerva, for what they were at Rome, their union has no meaning, nor does it form a conceptual structure. This is so true that in actual practice only Jupiter counts for anything.

On the other hand, the triad must have signified something for the founder, or for the Etruscans in general. What? We can only try to imagine. Greek mythology no doubt not only decorated their mirrors but impregnated their religious thought. Now, the grouping of Zeus with Hera and Athena, though its only cultic trace in Greece is in the *Phôkikon*, is nevertheless present, and meaningful, in several legendary ensembles which reached Italy, and particularly Etruria, at a very early date. The fate of Herakles—Hercules—was determined by these three divinities. Just before the confinement of Alcmena, Zeus, who fathered him at Tiryns, declares before the gods that the child who is about to be born will be king of the Argives. Consequently Hera delays Alcmena's delivery and causes Eurystheus to be born prematurely. Thus Alcmena's child will not be king. As compensation, Zeus promises that after he has performed twelve labors for Eurystheus he will be granted immortality. Thereafter, the infant Herakles having been exposed, Hera and Athena pass near him. Athena persuades Hera to give him her breast. He bites her so hard that the goddess throws him down. Then Athena takes him to his mother (Diod. Sic. 4.9.4-7). On the other hand, at the beginning of the fifth century at the latest, the legend of Aeneas was known in southern

Etruria. The fall of Troy, from which the Italic "naturalization" of Aeneas results, was decided or agreed to by Zeus, but it was originally desired and prepared for by the combined spite of Hera and Athena, whom the judgment of Paris had offended—a judgment which was itself arranged by Zeus. Stories like these may have accustomed men's mind's to associate Minerva, as the regulator of great destinies, with the Tinia-Uni couple, which appears throughout all of Greek myth.³⁰

This is all pure conjecture. This secret, as well as so many others, disappeared with Etruria. For Rome, by chance, this great indecision does not have the importance which the preceding discussions might lead one to expect. Although it is tantalizing to think that Hera's and Athena's grudge against Troy, among other legends, might perhaps have contributed to the bracketing of Jupiter O.M. by Juno and Minerva, let us close by repeating that Jupiter is in fact the sole active element of the Latinized triad, the sole master of the Capitol, and the sole patron of the Roman Republic.

30. A hypothesis. We have now learned (see below, pp. 452-53) that the legend of Aeneas was known, in southern Etruria and in Latium, at least at the beginning of the fifth century. If it could be imagined that it was known some decades earlier, could it not have served even then the awakening of Latin and Italic patriotism against the Etruscans? In this case, the appeal made by the "Tarquins," for the protection of *their* city, to the grouping of Greek divinities who had overthrown Troy and persecuted the Trojans might be understood as an ideological defense. Once the Etruscans had been chased out of Rome, the Latins, liberated but bound by the vow of the enemy, would have fulfilled it (or, if one follows R. Bloch, would have inherited the already dedicated sanctuary), but with Juno and Minerva losing for a long time all power and all significance, even by the side of Jupiter.

2

THE FIRES OF PUBLIC WORSHIP

When the writers of the great century wish to sum up Rome, its essence and its hopes, they always mention, in the same spirit of eloquence, three things which are dissimilar, yet which have the same meaning. In Livy (5.52.6-7), Camillus makes the following answer to the Roman plebs, greedy for lands and riches, and ready to abandon their native soil and settle themselves on the ruins of Veii:

. . . For, not to enumerate all the kinds of rites and all the gods, is it possible at the feast of Jupiter that the couch [*puluinar*] should be spread elsewhere than in the Capitol? Why need I speak of Vesta's eternal fires, and the image which is preserved as a pledge of empire in her temple? or of your sacred shields, O Mars Gradivus and Quirinus our Father? All these holy things would you leave behind on unconsecrated ground—things coeval with the City, and some more ancient than its origin?

In his ode about Regulus (3.5.5-12), Horace contrasts his hero with the legionaries captured by the Parthians, who have lightly forgotten their honor and their duties as Romans:

Did Crassus' troops live in base wedlock with barbarian wives and (alas, our sunken Senate and our altered ways!) grow old in service of the foes whose daughters they had wedded—Marsian and Apulian submissive to a Parthian king, forgetful of the sacred shields, the Roman name, the toga, and eternal Vesta, while Jove's temple and the city Rome remained unharmed?

The temple of Capitoline Jupiter, the shields of the *Salii*, and the perpetual fire of the house of Vesta: three signs, three chronological stages of the promise by which Rome lived. The fire was regarded as the most ancient. Some, anxious to ascribe to the second kingdom everything in religion which was majestic, claimed that it was established by Numa; others, remarking that Rome could not have

survived, even for a single season, without the sacred hearth, attributed it to Romulus—and was not the mother of the Founder an Alban Vestal? In fact, the national hearth was older than all this. To understand the most marked characteristics of the doctrine concerning it, we must compare it with its homologue, “the fire of the master of the house,” in Vedic religion. As early as 1864, one of the finest books written in the nineteenth century about these problems, *La cité antique*, by Numa-Denis Fustel de Coulanges,¹ clarified Vesta by a comparison with Agni. But scholarship has progressed in the last hundred years, and there is now an entire doctrine, not merely of the national hearth but of all the sacred fires, which must be envisaged. This doctrine is explicit in India, where ritual treatises abound, and implicit in Rome, where we have only the facts, along with a few scraps of commentary provided by pontifical science. But the comparison of the two uncovers resemblances too close to be fortuitous.

We have said that the Indians of Vedic times did not build sanctuaries or have fixed places of worship. Whoever offered a sacrifice, regardless of what this sacrifice was, prepared a piece of ground, following rules which were strict and constant, save in a few minor details. The essential arrangement was that of the fires: three fires, two principal and one accessory, or rather, two axial and one lateral. As the rituals were refined, other fires with special usages were added, but the first three form the framework of the consecrated area and are the basis of the ceremonies. They are acknowledged in the hymns. In some passages of the *Atharva Veda* they are called by their technical names. The *R̥g Veda*, allusive as always, designating without naming, refers to them several times, and one of these strophes, a ritual riddle, shows that the poet thoroughly understood the triad of the fires as a single structure.² As for the liturgical books, which are later than the hymns but which concern a still very conservative state of religion, they allow us to observe the articulation of the three fires, down to the smallest details, and are generous with useful explanations.³

1. Republished by Le club du meilleur livre, *Historia* 17, with a useful preface by W. Seston.

2. L. Renou, “Etudes védiques, 5,” *JA* 243 (1955): 426–27.

3. What follows sums up the second essay in Dumézil, *RIER* (“*Aedes rotunda Vestae*”), pp. 27–43, where the references to Indian ritual books are given.

The two axial fires, which lie on an east-west line, separated by variable distances according to the *varṇa* of the sacrificer, have distinct purposes and descriptions. One, called *gārhapatya*, or "fire of the *gṛhapati*, the master of the house," represents on the consecrated ground the sacrificer himself, with his familial and economic ties. It is the origin and the basis of the entire ceremony; the other fires are lighted from it, and if it is extinguished the sacrifice may not be continued, while if one of the other fires goes out, this one may be used to relight it. The *gārhapatya* must be lighted from a fire produced by friction, saved from an earlier sacrificial fire, or taken, regardless of the rank of the sacrificer, from the house of a *vaiśya*. During the ceremony the wife of the sacrificer stands close to it. In short, it expresses the rooted quality, the earthly authenticity of the man who addresses the gods. The liturgists call it "this world," "the earth." As such, it is round. The other axial fire, east of the first one, is called *āhavaniya* or fire of the offerings, properly (*ignis aspergendus*), and it is this fire whose smoke bears the gifts of men from this world to the gods: next to it, at one side, is placed the *vedi*, the turf couch on which the invisible gods are thought to come and sit, while on the other side, next to the sacrificer, stands the priest called *brahmān*, whose almost passive yet essential role is to assure by his mere presence the regular course of the rites. The liturgists say that this fire is "the other world," "the sky." As such, it is oriented to the cardinal points, and consequently is quadrangular. In this fundamental opposition, which makes the two fires the poles of the operation, the symbolism of "round" and "square," in connection with "the earth" and "the sky," corresponds not so much to a cosmological conception (even though the *Brāhmaṇa* remind us, on this occasion, that "the earth is round") as to the common-sense fact that there is no possible orientation on earth except in terms of celestial phenomena. While the sides of a rectangle may be oriented to the east, south, west, and north, that is, while they may be defined by the course of the sun, the circular shape repudiates and rejects such orientations. The third fire is called the "fire of the right, or of the south," *dakṣiṇāgni*. It is placed south of the axis which joins the *gārhapatya* and the *āhavaniya*, exactly at the boundary of the sacrificial area, and its function is to stand guard over this particularly dangerous side, from which the attacks of evil spirits are feared. By

a symbolism which is not clear, unless it is merely because an outline was needed which was neither square nor round, the *dakṣināgni* is semicircular, "fan-shaped." It is the poor relation in the family of fires, only rarely receiving libations (the riddle of *RV* I.164.1 designates it, among the "three brothers," as the "starved one").

This doctrine of the three fires, which has just been very schematically described, is itself connected with the more general doctrine of the three functions. If the fire to the south is a warrior-sentry, that of the master of the house has a particular affinity, as we have seen, for the class of the *vaiśya*, and the fire of the offerings, where the sacred transaction is performed, for the *brahmán* priest. Moreover, the doctrine is connected, at least by the two axial fires, with the division of the world into earth, atmosphere, and sky,⁴ where brahmanical science makes a further division of "three fires": earthly fire, the lightning, and the sun.

In the era which we know about, the way of life of the Italic peoples, who had long since become sedentary, was quite different from that to which the Vedic hymns bear witness, and which was still strongly marked by the traits of nomadism. Rome was a city, claiming to be eternal. To each of its cults it assigned a particular place, a *templum*, in which Greek or Etruscan art built a permanent *aedes* or *aedicula*. Moreover, the city regarded itself in certain respects as a vast and immovable *templum*, within which the dwellings of men and those of the gods were conjoined, separate but closely packed, and, save for conflagration, permanent.⁵ Despite this difference, resulting from a long history, the Roman observance of the sacred fires shows remarkable correspondences with the Indian observance. First, in every place of worship and for every sacred performance, we find the duality of the "fire of the master of the house" and "the fire of the offerings." On the "altar," *ara* or *altaria*,⁶ which in a few archaic cases is sufficient to itself, but as a general rule is situated in front of a sacred building, the offering will be burned and thus transmitted to the gods; but, by the side of the altar there must by necessity be a "hearth" (*nec*

4. Certain texts make the complete assimilation: *gārh.* = terrestrial world, *dakṣ.* (or *anvāhāryapacana*) = atmosphere, *āhav.* = celestial world: thus *Śat. Brāhm.* 12.4.1.3.

5. A. Magdelain, *Recherches sur l'"imperium": la loi curiate et les auspices d'investiture* (1968), pp. 61-67.

6. *ara* has a cognate in Hittite: *hašša-* "hearth, altar on which victims are burned." E. Laroche, *RPh.* 23 (1949): 36.

licere uel priuata uel publica sacra sine foco fieri, Serv. Aen. 3.134), which is used only before the sacrifice, to receive the incense and the wine of the *praefatio*—substances which, outside of this circumstance, belong chiefly to domestic worship. Because the place of worship is fixed and the sacrificer must leave his own house to get there, the hearth is merely symbolic: it is a *foculus*, a portable hearth; so, instead of being the basic and primary point of the sacrificial area like the Indian *gārhapatya*, it is brought into the vicinity of the fixed point, which is the other fire, the *ara*.

But it is on the scale of the city that the ancient doctrine of the duality of the principal fires produces the most meaningful arrangement. Envisaged as a vast unitary dwelling, Rome has on the one hand its own hearth, and on the other hand the altars of the places of worship, scattered throughout the city and increasingly more numerous. It is easy to see that on important points the respective qualities both of the one and of the others duplicate those of the *gārhapatya* and the *āhavanīya*.

The continuous fire of the *aedes Vestae*, the *ignis Vestae*, is indeed the hearth of Rome, and hence one of the guarantees of the city's being rooted in earth, of its permanence in history. It is tended by women. It must not go out, and if that accident occurs, it must not be relighted from the fire of another hearth, but from a new fire, produced in the fire-hole: the Vestals, after having been scourged with rods by the grand pontiff, rub a piece of wood taken from an *arbor felix*, until one of them is able to carry into the *aedes*, on a bronze sieve, fire produced by this friction (Paul. p. 228 L²). Thus this primary fire is quite essential. It is not the offspring of any other fire; it is truly of this world; and its function is entirely earthly, assuring the Romans of stability and permanence in their place on earth. And consider this: alone among the ancient sanctuaries assigned to purely Roman divinities, Vesta's is round.⁷

By contrast, in front of the temples of the other divinities there burns the *altaria* or *ara*, kindled for the occasion. Its purpose, as we have said, is only to carry the offering to its invisible recipient. Through

7. See the useful remarks of A. Brelich, *Vesta* (1949), pp. 41–42 and 112, n. 103. On the round temples at Rome, Wiss., p. 470, n. 1. On the buildings, Lugli, RA, pp. 202–15 (*Atrium Vestae: aedes, area, casa Vestalium*); Catalano, DA, p. 259, n. 44, has proposed a way of reconciling the views expressed here and Servius Aen. 7.153.

these fires, which are temporary and whose number is unrestricted, man tries to reach the other world, the world of the gods. And the temples are quadrangular.

Thus the opposition of round and square recurs, which Indian doctrine clearly explains by the symbolism of this world and the other world, earth and heaven. And this explanation holds true at Rome as well.⁸ The temples are quadrangular because they must be inaugurated and oriented, that is, defined, in terms of the four directions of the sky: the first acts of the augur consist in marking off the *regiones caeli*, one part *antica*, one *postica*, one *dextra*, and one *sinistra*. Here is how J. Marquardt sums up the inauguration of a *templum*:

Its location is marked out by the augurs and fixed by a solemn declaration (*quibusdam conceptis uerbis*). It is then called *locus effatus*, and serves to determine the shape of the building which will be erected there. It is a square or a rectangle whose four sides correspond to the four cardinal points; following the old Roman usage, the frontispiece faces to the west, in such a way that whoever sacrifices at the altar in front of the temple and can see the image of the god in the open *cella* is facing east. It is clear that the building is constructed according to a rite which is unknown in Greece (for in Greece the buildings consecrated to worship are, for the majority, oriented to the east) and which was not preserved for very long at Rome, since in later times the façades of the temples there frequently faced eastward.⁹

The house of Vesta is not square, precisely because it does not have to be inaugurated. All its power, all its bearing is directed solely to the earth, and it has nothing to do with the sky or with the directions of the sky. Thus it is only an *aedes sacra*, not a *templum*. Such was the feeling of the Romans themselves, a feeling which was important for religion and also for politics, because, since the *aedes Vestae* had not been inaugurated, the Senate could not meet in session there. In fact, in order to be *iustum*, a *senatus consultum* had to be held *in loco per augurem constituto, quod templum appellaretur* (Gell. 14.7.7). Some have gone so far as to claim that this was to prevent men, and hence the senators, from entering, that Numa had not wished that it be inaugurated: *Vestae aediculam, non templum statuit*. But this is a law-

8. On an Etruscan fact which may be comparable, see below, p. 652 (rose, gridwork).

9. *Le culte chez les Romains* (Manuel des antiquités romaines XII, 1, French translation) (1889), pp. 187-88.

yer's anachronism, and the real reason, simpler and more mystical, is the same one which, in India, prescribed the round shape—un-oriented, strictly of this earth—of the “fire of the master of the house.”

The agreement of the two doctrines may be followed in important details, for the *templa* as well as for the *aedes*.

We have seen that the orientation of the *templa* assigns the place of honor to the east. This seems also to have been true with regard to the various activities of the augurs. In the inauguration of Numa, carefully described by the annalists, if the king faces toward the south, the priest performs his ceremony after declaring the south to be his *pars dextra* (Liv. 1.18.7). Such was also the case in the operations which delimited the square perimeter of the Vedic “fire of the offerings.” It was marked out in two parts, both starting from the same point, the southwest angle: first by a straight furrow going from west to east and establishing the southern side (*daksina* “dexter”); then by a broken furrow, with two angles, going between the same two points as the preceding one, but following uninterruptedly the broken outline formed by the three other sides of a square, so that all the work was performed from west to east, the plow being brought back to its starting point after the first furrow, so that it would not make a mark in the other direction.¹⁰

A certain number of the known regulations of the *aedes Vestae*, not explained by the ancient authors, benefit from commentaries given by the Indians on homologous regulations concerning the “fire of the master of the house.”¹¹ Since it was the hearth of the great Roman family, whose habitat it simultaneously symbolized and guaranteed, the *aedes* was solemnly swept out once a year, on 15 June. This day, says Varro (*L.L.* 6.32) is marked *Q(uando) ST(ercus) D(elatum) F(as)*, and swept-up *stercus* is carried to a predetermined place, by way of the *clivus Capitolinus*. This is specified by Festus (p. 434 L²): the *stercus* removed from the sanctuary is carried to the alley about halfway up the *clivus Capitolinus* (*in angiportum medium fere cliui C.*), at a place which is closed by the *Porta Stercoraria*. Finally, if one is to believe Ovid, these *purgamina Vestae* were dumped into

10. *RIER*, p. 31.

11. What follows sums up “*QII. 7* (‘Trois règles de l’*aedes Vestae*’),” *REL* 37 (1959): 94–102, where the references to the Sanskrit texts are given; erratum *ibid.* 38 (1960): 98.

the waters of the Tiber (F. 6.713-14). The word *stercus* is specific. It has been thought that it referred to the ashes and debris from the hearth, but *stercus* has never meant anything but "animal droppings" or "dung." Thus it is a fossilized expression, dating from a time before the existence of the city, when an encamped pastoral society had to cleanse the location of its sacred fire of the *stercus* of its herds. Assuming that we are right in thinking that the *aedes* of republican times, like all of Rome's religious buildings, was constantly kept clean, the solemnity with which this annual act was performed proves that it was a very archaic rite, with a meaning which was both symbolic and peculiar to the ideology of this sanctuary.

Still in its capacity as the city's hearth, the *aedes*, besides its fire, shelters a domestic occupation. Here the Vestals prepare and store the sacred brine which is used to salt the *mola*, the sacred flour which they also prepare, on fixed days, and which must be sprinkled over (*immolare*) every animal led to sacrifice. Here is how Verrius Flaccus, following Veranius (Fest. p. 276 L²), defines this *muries*: it is a pickle, made with unpurified salt, ground in a mortar, stirred in an earthen pot, and then covered with gypsum and cooked over the fire. Thereafter the Vestal virgins cut it in pieces with an iron saw and throw it into the outer part of the *penus* of the *aedes Vestae*; there they mix it with spring water, or any other water except what comes from drains, and finally use it in the sacrifices.

The *gārhapatya* fire, or rather the location where it will be established on the plot of ground selected for the sacrifice, is the object of two rules which contrast it with the *āhavantiya* and which have the same meaning as the Roman regulations, though in a more symbolic form. This location, but not the other, must be swept out (*vyudūhati*), in order to chase away unclean occupants, with a branch of *palāśa*, a tree imbued with such strong sacred powers that it is assimilated to the *brāhman* itself. Why this difference between the two fires? "Because, through the fire of the master of the house, the sacrificer establishes himself, whereas through the fire of the offerings, he rises." Immediately after the sweeping, the officiating priest sprinkles this whole location, but not the other, with briny earth, or salt from the desert (*uṣāḥ*). Why this difference? "Because the fire of the master of the house (and not the fire of the offerings) is this world, and because the salty earth is cattle: in this way the officiating priest puts

cattle into this world." In these two descriptions we glimpse a more archaic pastoral and nomadic state of civilization, but one in which the same symbolic concerns occur as in the Roman cult.

Inversely, a third Indian prescription is paired with a prohibition of the *aedes Vestae*. At every establishment of the fires of the sacrificial area, the *Brāhmaṇa* order that a lotus leaf, the symbol of water, be placed on the location of what will be the "fire of the offerings," but not on that of the "fire of the master of the house." Why this difference? Because by doing so the officiating priest puts the waters in their true abode, the sky. At Rome we find the same distinction, but with the emphasis placed on the negative aspect. The *templa* always had to be close to supplies of water. According to Isidore of Seville (*Etym.* 15.4.9), the word *delubra* properly designates "*templa* having fountains in which one washed before entering"; but the phrase *fontes habentia* must have reflected the general situation, since *delubra* became an exact synonym for *templa* in poetry and exalted prose. Moreover Paulus gives the following definition for the word *fauissae* (of which this is only one of the meanings): "a place where water was kept in storage around the *templa*" (p. 205 L²). In contrast, the idea of water was repugnant to the *aedes Vestae*; what water was absolutely necessary for routine duties or for other tasks incumbent on the Vestals had to be fetched daily, at least in the earliest times, from a considerable distance outside of Rome (Plut. *Num.* 13.2; Prop. 4.4.9-22). And precautions were taken against this same water. According to Servius (*Aen.* 11.339), "The word *futile* denotes a vessel with a wide mouth but a narrow base, which was used in the cult of Vesta, because the water fetched for this cult is not put on the ground, and because, if that happens, it is a matter for expiation: whence the invention of this vessel which cannot stand upright and which empties out if one sets it down." It is clear that the Romans, who are not metaphysicians, simply cling to the idea that water and fire, in our earthly experience and practice, do not go together, that they are enemies, and that the first is dangerous to the second. The Indians take a broader view. While they avoid putting the symbol of water at the base of the fire "of this world" (which must not go out), they do place it "in the other world," where it is in harmony with the superior forms of fire: the ocean of the sky with the sun, or, in the atmosphere, the clouds with the lightning.

The Roman theory of the fires thus shows agreements with the Indian theory which go far beyond what Greece, in its cult of Hestia, can demonstrate as Indo-European survivals. Rome also preserved and deified the third aspect of fire, for which Greece has no equivalent; this aspect provided the Indian liturgists with the third fire of the sacrificial area, the "starved" fire, which keeps a lookout for evil spirits on its boundary. The Roman god Volcanus was the product of this aspect.¹² He is the fire which, for good or evil, devours and destroys. Thus, useful and dangerous at the same time, he has his temple outside the walls (Plut. Q.R. 47), in accordance with a regulation which Vitruvius (1.7.1) assigns to Etruscan wisdom and explains as the intention of not harboring among the houses of the city the god who might set them afire. It is possible that there was another intention in this location, the same one which locates Mars's places of worship outside the walls, namely, to turn the power of the god against the enemy, against the aggressor. In any case, like Mars, like a "Minerva" who must probably be interpreted as Nerio, like the goddess of Dissolution, Lua Mater, on the field of battle Volcanus receives the arms taken from the enemy, in order to destroy them (Liv. 1.37.5; 30.6.9; 41.12.6; Serv. Aen. 8.561-62). Similarly, in the case of *deuotio*, the arms of the *deuotus* (who might have the wicked idea of surviving), having become useless and even dangerous, are turned over to *Volcano siue cui alii diuo uouere uolet*, an expression which shows that Volcanus, except in special cases, is the god designated for this office.

In addition to having an external temple, which was situated near the Circus Flaminius and is mentioned for the first time in 214, there was a still more ancient place of worship, and, before the incorporation of the Capitol into the city, this place had been located, if not outside the city limits, at least at them. At the foot of the southeast flank of the Capitol, between the Comitium and the Forum, there was a small open space, called the Volcanal, with an altar open to the sky, the *area Volcani*. Here the devouring fire mounted

12. What follows sums up "OII 2 'Les pisciculi uiui des Volcanalia'," REL 36 (1958): 121-30, where discussions of several theses will be found (J. Carcopino, J. Toutain, H. J. Rose, M. Guarducci); see especially p. 123, n. 4, regarding the etymological explanation by the Cretan *Φελχάνος* and by the Etruscan. Le Gall, *Recherches sur le culte du Tibre* (1953), pp. 48-50, dismisses any connection between this offering of fishes to Volcanus and the *Ludi Piscatorii*, of which moreover nothing is known but the name (below, p. 622).

guard over one of the extremities of the Forum, and to it were entrusted the duties of mystical cleansing, particularly in connection with the misdeeds of its celestial brother, the *fulmen*. When the statue of Horatius Cocles was struck by lightning, it was removed from the Comitium to the Volcanal (Gell. 4.5.1-4), whither the remains of a *ludius* who had been struck by lightning were also transported (Fest. p. 392 L²). The date of his festival, the Volcanalia, 23 August, and its regulations indicate that he was held particularly accountable for the danger from fires which threatened crops and granaries during the scorching days of summer. On this day sacrifices were made to various divinities in various places: to Quirinus (on the Quirinal), to Ops Opifera (perhaps in the Forum), to the Nymphs and perhaps to Juturna (on the Field of Mars), and to Vulcanus himself ("in the Comitium," which probably means at the Volcanal) (CIL, I², 326-27). The common object of the various offerings so directed can only have been the protection of the grain by resorting to water and to the propitiation of the fire. This overriding concern also explains why Vulcanus is ranked, along with Quirinus and Ops, among the "gods of Titus Tatius," that is, among the gods of the third function. Nothing else is known of his cult except a cruel rite which was itself an expression, not of the collaboration of fire and water in the service of man, but of their basic and violent opposition. Small live fishes, "in place of human souls," were sacrificed to Vulcanus, probably in his fire at the Volcanal (Varr. L.L. 6.20; Fest. p. 345 L²). In the Indian tradition Agni is likewise the implacable enemy of fish.

As for the blacksmith Vulcanus of the poets, he is only a product of the *interpretatio graeca* as Hephaistos, one of the least successful in the whole theology. In fact, Greece furnished nothing comparable to Vulcanus; but it is probably because of his identification with Hephaistos that he sits, paired with Vesta, as early as the lectisternium of 217 (Liv. 22.10.9).¹³

The coherence of the implicit Roman theory of the fires, clarified by the explicit Indian theory, and the natural way in which the circular *aedes* of Vesta fits this theory, are persuasive arguments against

13. Vulcanus, probably as the god of metalwork, appears on the *dodrans*, one of the rare denominations added to the libral series, Mattingly, RC, p. 52 and pl. VI 6 (about 123 B.C.); but Vulcanus, being essentially the god of devouring and devastating fire, is excluded, like Mars, from the libral series proper.

retaining the usual interpretation of the round shape as a religious survival of the ancient Italic hut.¹⁴ Moreover, if there were any basis to that interpretation, it would be hard to understand why this archaism was restricted to the geometrical idea of roundness: a stylization of the cabin would necessarily have been retained, through the remodelings of the monument.

Before we leave these Indo-European origins, let us point out two features which are connected with them.

First, the name of the goddess, a derivative in *-ta-*, of a rare and archaic type, from the root **a₁eu-* "to burn," with an *s* suffix (E. Benveniste). Of the two possible forms of this expanded root, the first, **a₁eu-s-*, is found in Greek *εὔει*, Latin *ūrīt* (*ustus*), Vedic *ṛṣati* "he burns"; the second, **a₁u-es-*, in *Vesta*, and probably in the Greek *Ἑστία*. Although *Vesta*'s name scarcely occurs except in the cities of Latium, the Umbrian *uesticatu* "libato" (with a god *Vesticio-* "Libasius"?) and the name of the *Vestini*, a mountain people of Samnium, are perhaps evidence of a wider distribution; but other explanations have been proposed for these words.

Second, the custom of having *Vesta* terminate every act of worship addressed to more than one divinity.¹⁵ Cicero says (*Nat. d.* 2.27), in an artificial justification of this custom: "Her power extends over altars and hearths, and therefore all prayers and all sacrifices end with this goddess, because she is the guardian of the innermost things." There is no reason to doubt this rule, which is symmetrical with the one that consecrates the *prima* to *Janus*. It is diametrically opposed to the Greek rule which claims, under the same circumstances, that the first divinity to be invoked is *Hestia*. An exhaustive inquiry into the various Indo-Iranian societies has produced the following results: in the *R̥gVeda*, the hymns to multiple divinities and the sacrifices offered to several gods frequently put *Agni* in one of two places, either at the beginning or at the end, and sometimes at both; on important ritual occasions, *Mazdaism* puts *Ātar*, the Fire, at the end of the list which enumerates, after the supreme god, the six great Archangels (*Aməša Spənta*), and then a few Entities; and finally, among the modern

14. For example, Frazer, *Fast.* 4: 179-86.

15. What follows sums up "QII. 12 ('*Vesta extrema*')," *REL* 39 (1961): 250-57 (p. 250, n. 3, concerning Latte, p. 207).

Ossetes, the last descendants of the Scythians, it is likewise the spirit of fire who ends the "general prayer," addressed to fourteen gods or spirits and serving as a framework for all the particular liturgies. Thus it seems that the Indo-Europeans had already located their divinity of the beneficent fire at one or the other end positions of the sacrifice. The various peoples descended from them showed a preference for a particular one of the two. The precise agreement on this point between the Romans and the Iranians is remarkable.

As generally happens wherever it occurs, the perpetual fire was put out and solemnly rekindled once a year, on 1 March (Ov. *F.* 3.143-44), at the same time that the old laurels were replaced by fresh ones in the Regia, in the curiae, and in the houses of the flamens (Macr. 1.12.6).

The importance and talismanic meaning ascribed to this fire caused the *aedes Vestae*, as the political and literary pretensions and annexations of Rome increased through the ages, to become the conservatory of other talismans, *pignora* or *signa fatalia*, deposited in the innermost part of the *penus*. Servius lists seven of these (*Aen.* 7.188), half of them furnished by Asia and Greece. From the legend of Troy alone came the Palladium, the veil of Iliona, Priam's eldest daughter, and the scepter of Priam himself. In earlier times there was probably a less ambitious collection, but its secret has been well kept. If we may believe an indiscreet tradition, the function of fertility was crudely represented in this little museum by the likeness of a male sex organ (Plin. *N.H.* 28.39).

As for Vesta herself, the *Vesta publica populi Romani*, she had the privilege, admired by Ovid (*F.* 6.299), of not being represented in her sanctuary by any image, since the fire alone sufficed to typify her; and Ovid calls himself a fool for having believed otherwise for so long. Originally this had been true of all the Roman divinities: Vesta was simply the most conservative. Yet we have reasons for thinking that this irregularity, in the vestibule of the *aedes Vestae*, had been normalized before the first century B.C., since Cicero says that the blood of the venerable pontiff Q. Mucius Scaevola spattered the statue of the goddess.¹⁶

¹⁶ Frazer, *Fast.* 4: 216-20. It is perhaps this interdiction which did not allow Vesta to be represented on any denomination of the libral series; see above, pp. 208, n. 6, and 321, n. 13.

During the days of the solemn cleansing, from 7 to 15 March, access to the building was open to women, who entered it barefoot. Outside of this period, only the Vestals and the *pontifex maximus* were admitted, but even the latter was forbidden to enter the holy of holies, the *penus*.

A picturesque extension has added to the cult of the beneficent fire the operations which produce the basic food, bread. Probably this extension developed from the private, domestic cult of the hearth,¹⁷ even though the bakers, as well as the millers along with the animals who turn the millstone, and the stone itself, are the worshippers or the beneficiaries of the public feast on 9 June (Ov. F. 6.311-18):

Lo, loaves are hung on asses decked with wreaths, and flowery garlands veil the rough millstones. Husbandmen used formerly to toast only spelt in the ovens, and the goddess of ovens has her own sacred rites: the hearth of itself baked the bread that was put under the ashes, and a broken tile was laid on the warm floor. Hence the baker honours the hearth and the mistress of hearths and the she-ass that turns the millstones of pumice.

Although we must believe that the villages on the Palatine already had their perpetual fires, the only location of an *aedes Vestae* known to history is the one in the Forum. Destroyed at the time of the Gallic catastrophe at the beginning of the fourth century and later reconstructed, the circular building was not spared by the devouring flames. Burned in 241, it barely escaped being burned again in 210. It was beautified by Augustus, but burned once more under Nero in A.D. 64, and in 191 under Commodus. Septimius Severus and Caracalla rebuilt it, and Theodosius closed it down in 394, after the defeat of Eugenius. Nevertheless it survived almost intact until the sixteenth century, and there are still useful drawings of it made in that period.

The fire of 241 gave rise to a legend, for which A. Brelich has provided an interpretation of great mythographic interest, since it involves an early myth which was revived well along in the third century and applied at that time to a well-known historical figure.¹⁸ L. Caecilius Metellus was consul in 251 and 247, dictator in 224, and

17. On Vesta in the private cult, below, pp. 354 and 611; without being as negative as Wilamowitz, I am unable to accept the position which Latte still defends, p. 90, nn. 1 and 3.

18. "Il mito nella storia di Cecilio Metello," *SMSR* 15 (1939): 30-41.

grand pontiff until his death, which is to say for a very long time. As a general he distinguished himself in Sicily during the First Punic War, and his triumphal procession was a very famous one. In it, we are told, marched a hundred elephants captured from the Carthaginians and brought to Rome after a daring sea-crossing. He also played a great role in religion; his pontificate was marked by increased disciplinary rigor. In short, he was one of those characters who leave their mark both on history and on common lore. But it was in 241 that he lived his most glorious hour. The fire had started in the sanctuary of Vesta and was about to consume the Palladium and all the other sacred objects which no man, not even he, the grand pontiff, had the right to look upon. Without hesitating, he plunged into the flames, saved the talismans, and came out again, blind.

The improbability of this last feature has often been emphasized. If Caecilius Metellus became blind in 241, how could he have been made dictator seventeen years later, how could he even have retained his pontificate? Such offices are not open to men with such defects. The writers of antiquity had already noticed the strangeness of the situation, and one of the *Controuersiae* of Seneca the Elder debates the obligation of the blinded priest either to resign or not to resign, using plenty of entirely human arguments which would have carried no weight in an affair involving sacred law. And still, blindness is the principal element of the story; it is in order to explain it that so many authors, notably moralists, have spoken about the fire.

Brelich was the first to notice that this improbable and celebrated accident of Caecilius Metellus in 241 bears a strong resemblance to what is told about Volcanus's son Caeculus, the legendary ancestor of the *gens* Caecilia and the mythical founder of the Latin city of Praeneste. This hero had been conceived near the hearth, that is, in Vesta's domestic abode, and as a result of the smoke his eyes had remained smaller than is normal. This gave rise to his surname, "the little blind one," and consequently to the name of the *gens*. It is a name which exaggerates the facts, but at any rate it draws attention to a malformation of the eyes due to the action of the hearth, *quam rem frequenter efficit fumus*. The legend adds that after Caeculus grew up, one day when someone expressed doubt that Volcanus was his father, he stirred up a terrible conflagration.

It is likely, as Brelich has suggested, that the Vulcanian myth of the

eponymous hero was inserted into the actual event and expanded to the national scale, in order to justify the highest distinction of one of the principal Caecilii. We recognize here several of the elements of the original story, grouped differently, but still grouped together: Vesta's hearth, the eyes damaged by fire, and the conflagration. This literary operation could not have taken place until after the death of the man concerned (221), at the end of the third century, in Hannibal's time and in the full light of history. It provides a measure of the ease with which, one hundred or fifty years earlier, the accepted version of the story of the Roman origins had been formed, based in large part on old myths pertaining to the people or to a particular *gens*.

3

FRAMEWORKS

THE BEGINNINGS

If Vesta comes last, *extrema*, in offerings and prayers, Janus is first: so we are told by Cicero (*Nat. d.* 2.27). Thus the two of them form the most general liturgical framework. But this position of Janus is not restricted to the liturgy. Saint Augustine (*Ciu. D.* 7.9) has copied from Varro a remarkable definition, in which *prima* is articulated with another superlative: the *prima* belong to Janus, the *summa* to Jupiter. An excellent commentary follows this formula: Jupiter is thus deservedly the *rex*, because the *prima* are outranked by the *summa*, the only advantage of the former being in terms of time, while the latter are first in terms of *dignitas*.¹

Everything that we know about Janus serves to confirm both this rule and this conception. He is the first to be invoked or served: (1) in the formula of *deutio*, where his name is the first in a long enumeration of divinities; (2) in the "personal" part of the song of the Salii, where the verses called *ianuli* are mentioned before the *iunonii* and the *mineruii* (Fest. p. 95 L²); (3) in an important ritual of the Fratres Arvales (ed. Henzen, pp. 144-47), where Janus *pater*, followed by Jupiter, comes first on a list which ends with Vesta; and (4) in the *praefatio* of the two agrarian rituals described by Cato (*Agr.* 134, 141).

1. Above, p. 100. Bibliography of recent studies on Janus at the beginning ("Prefatory Note") of L. A. MacKay, *Janus*, University of California Publications in Classical Philology, vol. 15 (1956), pp. 157-82. The facts cited in the first part of R. Schilling, "Janus, le dieu introducteur, le dieu des passages," *MEFR*, 1960, pp. 89-100, refute the hypercriticism of Latte, p. 134. A. Ernout, in *Philologica* 2 (1957): 175, thinks that *Janus* may come from the Etruscan; however, it is easier to imagine the transition of *Janus* to Etruscan *Ani* (cf. *Iuno-Uni*) than the reverse. It is not possible for me to follow in many parts of its development and in its conclusions the ingenious hypothesis of Mrs. Adams Holland, *Janus and the Bridge*, *PMAAR* 21 (1961).

And regardless of the period, whatever function, whatever attribution of the god we consider derives immediately from his patronage of the *prima*, or, as Saint Augustine says elsewhere, from his control over all beginnings (*omnium initiorum potestatem*, *Ciu. D.* 7.3.1; *potestatem primordiorum*, 7.10).

For some time it has been fashionable to deny to the Roman barbarians of the first centuries the faculty of abstraction, for which, however, their language provided such ample means, and which was exercised so freely in the theologies of their cousins in primitive India and Iran, as well as those in Scandinavia and Ireland. This fashion will pass, but for three decades it has had the effect, among other unfortunate results, of complicating and confusing Janus's file, which is one of the clearest and best balanced that we have. If we do not sacrifice the facts to this *a priori* doctrine, the god presents himself as follows.

The probable etymology of his name, a stem in *-o*, or, archaically, a stem in *-u-* (whence the derivatives *ianua*, *Januarius*, though the latter may actually be formed on the analogy of *Februarius*), identifies him as "passage." It is built on the base **yā-*, an expansion of **ei*, which, in the other western Indo-European language where it has produced a derivative, also indicates a passage: the Irish *áth* (which occurs in the official name of Dublin, *Baile Átha Cliath*), from **yā-tu-*, means "ford." Cicero (*Nat. d.* 2.27) in his comments was correct in observing that the *transitiones peruiæ* are called *iani* and that the *fores in liminibus profanarum aedium* are called *ianua*. There are in fact two ways of conceiving of beginnings: either they are a "birth," in which case they belong in Juno's domain, or they are a "passage" from one state to another, and depend on Janus. This is the source of the connections and confluences between Juno and Janus, several of which have already been indicated. But while the first conception is applicable to only a few beginnings, the second is valid for all of them, even the most abstract: whence the more generalized activity of Janus in this function. Janus patronizes beginnings, understood in this way, not only in religious contexts, but in space, time, and existence.

1. Spatially, he stands on the thresholds of houses, at the doors, *ianitor*, presiding over the two beginnings symbolized by entrance and departure, and over the other two which are created by the opening and the closing of the door. He is *Patulcius* and *Clusius*, two epithets

which speak for themselves (Ov. *F.* 1.128-29). We know the important role which this idea plays in the special case of peace and war, in what Virgil calls *belli portae*. We have also seen how it inspired the complex appellation of "Janus-Quirinus," from which certain exegetes have tried to draw conclusions which it does not support.² The legend of the origins likewise places him at the door of the Capitol (Ov. *Met.* 14.782-90), from which it clearly appears how a secondary role as *custos* naturally develops from his position on the threshold (Ov. *F.* 1.120-23; Lyd. *Mens.* 4.2). But there are more important thresholds: the outer hill, set down in front of Rome as it were, is the hill of the god, the Janiculum.

In this aspect of his function, the most material one, Janus has a colleague who is himself strictly confined to it. This is Portunus, whom Varro defines as *deus portuum portarumque praeses* (Schol. Veron. in *Verg. Aen.* 5.241). This duality masks a unity of which the words themselves are evidence, and which Giuliano Bonfante has proposed should be traced back to the times when the ancestors of the Romans passed through a period of living in pile structures, and when the approach to the villages on pileworks was at the same time a "port" and a "portal."³ Like Janus, Portunus is portrayed with a key in his hand (Paul. p. 161 L²); as we have seen, it is the flamen of Portunus who greases the arms of Quirinus considered in that function of *Mars qui praeest paci* which allowed the assimilation of Quirinus to Janus. Moreover, a correspondence of dates has been correctly emphasized: the *dies natalis* of the temple of Janus in the *Forum holitorium* at the time of its reconstruction under Tiberius is the same as that of the Portunalia (17 August). This kinship of the two gods would provide confirmation, if any were needed, of the etymology of Janus. The word for "ford," in one division of the Celtic languages, Gaelic, was *yā-tu-, and in the others, Gaulish and Brittonic, *ritu-, (that is, *pṛtu-). Corresponding to the Irish *áth* is the Gaulish *Ritu-* in *Ritumagos* "Riom" (the "Field of the Ford"), and the Welsh *rhyd* (*Rhydychen* "Ox-ford").

2. To Janus was entrusted the "beginning of the year," which has preserved this meaning until our times. Indeed, it is as god of the

2. Above, p. 100; cf. (against V. Basanoff) "La triade Juppiter Mars Janus?" *RHR* 132 (1964): 115-23.

3. "Tracce di terminologia palafitticola nel vocabolario latino?" *Atti del istituto Veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti* 97 (1937): 53-70 (pp. 64-65 on *porta-portus*).

"first month" of the reformed calendar—sometimes, through an illegitimate extension, as god of the year—that numerous ancient authors celebrated Janus. Macrobius (1.13.3), speaking of Numa and his calendar, stressed the "transition" aspect of this patronage: January is the point at which two years touch. The first festival of the year, on 9 January, is the *agonium* of Janus.

Parallel with Juno, who is their true mistress, Janus is present at the Calends, the first day of every month. This fact has quite recently been contested by Kurt Latte and at the same time confirmed by R. Schilling, and it is certainly the latter who is right. Nothing but prejudice obliges us to reject either Macrobius (1.9.16), who says that Janus was invoked under the name of *Junonius* as opening not merely the month of January but all the months, or Lydus (*Mens.* 4.2), who holds with Varro that Janus was called "the god of the cakes," in Greek *Ποπάωνων*, because cakes, *πόπανα*, were offered to him on the Calends: we have by chance precise information of a kind of cake which was reserved for Janus and called *ianual* (Paul. p. 227 L²); and does not Ovid give the recipe for a kind of cake, in connection with the Calends of January (*F.* 1.127)?

Even in the day, the morning seems to belong to him. It is too easy to dismiss⁴ Horace's apostrophe (*Serm.* 2.6.20–23), on the pretext of the humorous tone of these lines: "O Father of the dawn, or Janus, if you prefer to be so called, from whom men take the beginnings of the work and toil of life [*primos . . . instituunt*]"—such is the will of the gods—be the prelude of my song." The learned solar theory, which Macrobius impartially records (*Janum quidam solem demonstrari uolunt . . .*; 1.9.9), can only have sprung from this patronage of the morning.

Finally, Janus was inserted into historical times, at the place where we might expect him: at the beginning. It was said that he had been the first king of Latium and the king of an Age of Gold, when men and gods lived together (*Ov. F.* 1.247–48).⁵ Having thus entered into "history," he was provided with the usual appurtenances of human life—a wife, children, friends—which are of little importance here. But other contexts go even further. When the initial Chaos of the Greeks is communicated to Rome, the Roman philosophers move Janus

4. Latte, p. 54, n. 4.

5. On the pseudo-history of primitive Latium, see A. Brelich, "I primi re latini," in *Tre variazioni romane sul tema delle origini* (1956), pp. 48–94.

proportionally further back (Fest. p. 157 L²: *Cui primo supplicabant ueluti parenti, et a quo rerum omnium factum putabant initium*; Ov. F. 1.102–12). The song of the Salii seems already to have qualified him as *duonus cerus* (Varro L.L. 6.26) or *cerus manus* (Paul. p. 249 L²), a phrase which was understood as *creator bonus*. The poets, like Septimius Serenus (fragment 23, E. Baehrens, *Fragmenta poetarum Romanorum* [1886]), outdo them, calling him *o cate rerum sator, o principium deorum*. Finally it will be said that he was “the oldest god indigenous to Italy” (Herodian. 1.16.1), and “the first of the ancient gods whom the Romans called Penates” (Procop. B. Got. 1.19.25). On the basis of texts like these, several authors, forgetting that they are dealing only with one specification of the *prima* among many others, have constructed the singular theory which makes Janus, *actually*, an older god than Jupiter and the “principal god” of the earliest religion, whom a “reform” is supposed to have demoted to Jupiter’s advantage.

3. Several natural beginnings are patronized or facilitated by Janus. He plays a role in the conception of the embryo, opening a way for the reception of the seed (Aug. Ciu. D. 6.9.5; 7.2 and 3.1); his head appears on the one-*as* piece, the beginning of the libral series (Ov. F. 1.229–30). He is a great inventor: it is he who founded religion, constructed the first temples (Lyd. Mens. 4.2; Macr. 1.9.3), instituted the Saturnalia (Macr. 1.7.4), and invented metal coinage (Plut. Num. 19.6–9, etc.). These fantasies and a few others, dating from various eras, prove only one thing, but prove it well: the authenticity and productivity of the fundamental definition of the god.

The conception of Janus as *bifrons* is probably an ancient one, and is also a result of his definition. Every transition or passage implies two places or two conditions, that which one is leaving and that which one is entering. In India, Aditi is called “two-faced” because she begins and ends a ceremony,⁶ and from ancient Babylonia to modern West Africa gods with a comparable function show the same expressive duality. Only the plastic embodiment given to this symbolic representation must have come to Rome from abroad, whether from the “double Hermes” of Greece, or from further away.⁷

6. Śat.Brāhm. 3.2.4.16 (*ubhayataḥśiṛṣṇi*) and Eggeling’s note *ad locum*.

7. J. Marcadé, “Hermès doubles,” BCH 76 (1952): 596–624.

As for the *templum Jani* in the Forum, which was not exactly a temple, and which was attributed to Numa, its precise location has not been determined:⁸ according to Livy (1.19.2), it was at the foot of the Argiletum, according to Macrobius (1.9.17), at the foot of the Viminal. There are also discussions, which nonreconcilable texts provide with ammunition, about the number of the famous doors—two? one?—about their location, about their very nature, and about the meaning of the expression *Janus Geminus*. But this does not affect the theory of the god, any more than the two contradictory interpretations offered by the ancients regarding the connection of the sanctuary with the war-peace articulation. According to some, Pandora's jar contained health, according to others, the various diseases and ailments afflicting mankind; but when it was opened the result was the same: either health was lost, or the diseases were put into circulation. In the same way, the temple of Janus, when it is closed, keeps or restrains either precious peace or fearful war. Which? In the interview which he grants to the author of the *Fasti*, Janus himself gets confused. He says that he permits peace to leave his "tranquil halls" (1.121-22), but immediately after he congratulates himself on keeping the wars confined behind unbending bars (123-24); later the same building is still a prison, but for peace: *Paci fores obdo, ne qua discedere possit*. The other temple of Janus, built in 260 in the *Forum holitorium* by the consul C. Duilius, does not raise so many problems. There the *bifrons* was only one more god among a number of others.

The ancients were aware of the originality of Janus. Ovid comments (F. 1.90) that Greece does not know him. For the historian of religions it is more notable that in Italy, even in Latium, Janus seems to be exclusively Roman, with this reservation, important because the borrowing was probably made from other Italic peoples, of the Etruscan *Ani*. Nevertheless there are comparative reasons for believing Janus to be ancient and, in terms of his function, Indo-European. The most highly structured theologies we know, the Scandinavian and the Indo-Iranian, portray one or more "first gods."⁹ The Scandinavian *Heimdallr* especially recalls Janus, both in space and in time. Sta-

8. For example, P. Grimal, "Le 'Janus' de l'Argilette," *MEFR*, 1952, pp. 39-58, and, contra, Schilling, "Janus. . .," p. 113, n. 2; cf. also A. Boethius, *Il tempio di Giano in imo Argiletu* (1950); A. Audin, "Janus, le génie de l'Argiletum," *LH* 10 (1951): 52-91.

9. "Remarques comparatives sur le dieu scandinave *Heimdallr*," *Etudes celtiques*, 1959, pp. 262-83.

tioned "at the limits of earth," "at the furthest point of the sky," he is the watchman of the gods; "born in the beginning," he is the ancestor of humanity, the procreator of the classes, and the founder of the whole social order; and yet he is decidedly inferior to the sovereign god Óðinn. The *Shorter Völuspá* defines him in comparison with Óðinn in almost the same terms by which Varro contrasts Janus, the god of the *prima*, and Jupiter, the god of the *summa*. Heimdallr was born "primigenius" (*varð einn borinn í árdaga*), Óðinn was born "maximus" (*varð einn borinn öllum meiri*).¹⁰ It is possible that the "initial function" had been stabilized in other cities of Latium, but had been identified with different divine figures, and, as sometimes happens, figures of the other sex. This is probably the case with the *Fortuna Primigenia*, that is, "primordial," of Praeneste.

Unlike Portunus, Janus has no flamen. Some say that the *rex sacrorum* is his special priest. This is at least excessive. The king, who does indeed have some connections with him, is involved in too many other services to be confined to this one. The "primacy" of the king is rather "supremacy," and his interdependence with the *flamen Dialis*, as it is glimpsed in the ancient monarchy, connects him rather with Jupiter. Moreover, the king is not concerned with the whole of Janus, but apparently only with his responsibilities for beginning a period of time. For example, there is no rite in which the king is involved at the threshold of any building, or at the Janiculum. When he seems to originate some activity belonging to the ancient royal jurisdiction (the opening of the Lupercalia, *Ov. F.* 2.21; possibly the opening of the military season, Latte, pp. 117-18), no special reference to Janus is made. Still, it must be remembered that there is a very close tie between Heimdallr and kingship; not that Heimdallr himself is king, but that he creates the royal function and sets up the first king. Analogous Indian facts have also been suggested.

THE TIMES

Poets and thinkers have sometimes made Janus the god of the year, which his month begins (*Ov. F.* 1.62-64; *Lyd. Mens.* 4.1; etc.). On an

10. *Hyndluljóð*, str. 37 and 40; analogous Iranian formulas in an Avestan *gāthā* (*Yasna* 45, first lines of strs. 2, 4, 6), *Tarpeia*, pp. 86-88.

old statue of him, perhaps a xoanon, some have even claimed to recognize in the arrangement of the fingers, which were doubtless very worn, the number 365 (Lyd. *Mens.* 4.1; Plin. *N.H.* 34.33; etc.). The offering of grain on the Calends is also related to this meaning, and some have arrived at the bizarre conception of twelve altars belonging to Janus, each being used at the beginning of each month. Varro is the warranty for these altars (Lyd. *Mens.* 4.1; Macr. 1.9.16), but probably they never went beyond the theoretical stage.

Did the periodic divisions of time have specific patrons? Those of the month certainly did. As we have seen, the Ides belonged to Jupiter, while all the Calends were in *ditione Junonis* (Macr. 1.9.16), and Janus also took an interest in them. The division of the year into seasons was not so strict, but without forming a structure, important feasts which involved special divinities introduced several seasons.

In the middle of March, the first month of the earliest calendar, in addition to the popular carnival celebrating the expulsion of "the old man of March," Mamurius Veturius, there was the festival of Anna Perenna. It too was popular, but it was also official:¹¹ *et publice et priuatim ad Annam Perennem sacrificatum itur, ut annare perennareque liceat* (Macr. 1.12.6; cf. Lyd. *Mens.* 4.36). This merrymaking provided Ovid with material for one of his liveliest descriptions: the crowd, *plebs*, throngs to the banks of the Tiber and settles down on the green grass; "some camp under the open sky, a few pitch tents, and some make a leafy hut of boughs." They drink heavily, and pray for as many years as they empty cups. There are men who drain "as many goblets as Nestor numbered years," and women who "would live to the Sibyl's age if cups could work the charm." There they sing the songs they picked up in the theaters, gesticulate, and dance without restraint. On their way home they are unable to walk a straight line; the passersby who see them say, "How happy they are!" (*F.* 3.523-40).¹²

11. O. Immisch, "Der Hain der Anna Perenna," *Philol.* 83 (1928): 183-92 (on the location of the *lucus*). Anna Perenna was one of the important points in the construction of my first book, *Le festin d'immortalité* (1924), of which today I retain almost nothing; it served only to open my long period of tentative exploration which lasted until 1938.

12. It is necessary to insist on the *concrete* character of the representations and rites of Rome which are relative to the time, as well as to everything else (places, etc.). They do not rest on general speculations but on the needs of the moment.

There is no public festival marking the equinoxes or the summer solstice, and no divinity patronizes them, but the winter solstice has its own goddess.¹³ These shortest days of the year are a pathetic period, a crisis in nature, which is climaxed on 21 December by the *bruma*. But if *bruma*, “breuissima (dies),” objectively designates the solstice, a particular point in the curve of time, the uneasiness and disquiet, whether actually experienced or stylized, caused by the gradual shortening of the daylight hours is better expressed by another root, which has also produced the word *angor*. At every stage of the language it is good Latin to use *angustiae* to denote a period of time which is felt to be too short, to be distressingly or grievously short. Macrobius does not fail to use this word, and to repeat it when he dramatizes this turning point of the year (1.21.15): “the time when the light is *angusta* . . .; the solstice, the day when the sun finally emerges *ex latebris angustisque* . . .” After three years of exile in Thrace, the unhappy Ovid groans. His unhappiness, he says, renders him insensible to both the pleasures and the tedium of the seasons (*Tr.* 5.10.7–8): “The summer solstice does not shorten my nights, nor does the winter solstice make my days *angustos*.”

Religion experienced these *angustos dies*. A goddess and a cult therefore guaranteed that they would pass. Just as a goddess Bellona caused the crisis of war to take a turn for the better, just as an Orbona, in the lesser mythology, seems to have taken care of parents who had lost their children (*Cic. Nat. d.* 3.63; *Arn. Gent.* 4.7), just as a Pellonia helped to repulse the enemies (*Arn. Gent.* 4.4), and just as a Fesson(i)a allowed travelers to master their fatigue (*Aug. Ciu. D.* 4.21), so a *Diua Angerona* allowed this kind of *angustiae* to pass. Her feast, the Divalia or Angeronalia, occurs on 21 December, the solstice itself. On this day the pontiffs offer a sacrifice to her in *curia Acculeia* (*Varr. L.L.* 6.23) or in *sacello Volupiae*, near the Porta Romanula, one of the inner gates of Rome, on the north face of the Palatine (*Macr.* 1.10.7). In this chapel, in *ara Volupiae* (*Macr.* 1.10.8), was a statue of the

13. What follows sums up the second essay in *DL* (“*Diua Angerona*”), pp. 44–70, where the earlier bibliography will be found (notably H. Wagenvoort, J. Hubaux). The lines which Latte, p. 134 and n. 4, devotes to Angerona are a clear example of what “die philologische Kritik des Materials,” left to itself, can accomplish; I shall examine them elsewhere. After my essay, see M. Renard, “A propos d’Angerona et d’une urne étrusque,” *Coll. Lat.* 45 (*Hommages à G. Dumézil*) (1960): 168–71. Nothing in Angerona’s file suggests that her silence is that of death. On Viðarr, see my study “Le dieu scandinave Viðarr,” *RHR* 218 (1965): 1–13, and *ME* 1: 230–37.

goddess, with her mouth bandaged and sealed, and also, according to one witness (Solin. 1.6), with one finger on her lips in the gesture enjoining silence. This last feature must have contributed toward making her, along with some others, a candidate for the title of the secret goddess *in cuius tutela urbs Roma est* (Macr. 3.9.3-4).

The attitude of the statue is enigmatic, but we do not have the right to reject the lesson it offers on the pretext that every plastic portrayal, at Rome, comes from abroad. The Romans would not have portrayed Angerona in such a particular way unless the bandage and the finger on the lips had corresponded to something they knew about her, which could only be her determination to maintain silence. Nor do we have the right, on the pretext that silence is sometimes a characteristic of death, to attribute to the goddess an infernal meaning which nothing in her file suggests. I have proposed another solution, based on the comparison of myths which, in other Indo-European societies, relate to the same situation. One of the reasons for silence, in India and elsewhere, is to concentrate one's thought, one's will, one's inner voice, and to obtain from this concentration a magic efficacy which the spoken word does not have;¹⁴ and the various mythologies are quick to put this power at the service of the threatened sun.

Among the Scandinavians, the strongest of the gods after þórr is Víðarr, "to whom," says Snorri, "the gods appeal in all times of peril." Actually, his only known intervention takes place at the time of Ragnarök, the twilight of the gods. In the great crisis when the old world disappears, when the wolf Fenrir has devoured Óðinn (*Völuspá* 53; *Edda Snorra St.*, p. 72, ed. Finnur Jónsson 1931), and when the sun too has been swallowed by "the wolves" (*Edda Sn. St.*, p. 75), either by Fenrir himself (*Vafþrúðnismál* 46) or by one of Fenrir's sons (*Grimnismál* 39), it is Víðarr who alone engages and destroys Fenrir (*Völ.* 55) and makes possible the rebirth of the world. Thereafter the extinguished sun (*Sól* is feminine) is replaced by her daughter, fortunately born before she was devoured by Fenrir (*Vafþr.* 47). Two points are

14. L. Renou, "La valeur du silence dans le culte védique," *JAOS* 69 (1949): 11-18. To the file on the powers of the Indian silence, and of philosophical silence ("discussion by silence is the supreme discussion"), should be added E. Lamotte, *L'enseignement de Vimālakīrti*, Bibliothèque du Muséon, vol. 51 (1962), p. 317, and the long n. 43. Cf. O. Casel, *De philosophorum graecorum silentio mystico*, *RVV* 16, 2 (1919); G. Mensching, *Das heilige Schweigen*, *RVV* 20, 2 (1926).

to be noted: (1) the eschatological crisis in which the sun is swallowed by Fenrir is regarded as a winter, "the Great Winter," *Fimbulvetr*; (2) Víðarr, the god who guarantees the rebirth of the world by killing Fenrir, is defined as "the silent As," *hina þögli áss* (*Edda Sn. St.*, p. 33), and this silence must be connected with his extraordinary power and his feat of delivery. The analogy with Angerona's task in the *angusti dies* of winter is illuminating: it was likewise through her silence and through the concentration of mystical power which it produced that Angerona must have fulfilled her duty of saving the wintry sun from danger. Vedic mythology applies this prescription of silence, which is also used extensively in the Indian rituals, to a solar crisis which is not that of winter, but of eclipse. When the sun was hidden in the demoniacal darkness, Atri, a hero of ancient times, pulled it out "by means of the fourth *bráhman*" and by offering a cult to the gods "through a naked adoration." For reasons set forth at length in 1956, we are led to believe that this "fourth" *bráhman* is the inner voice and that the "naked" adoration is worship without the spoken word.¹⁵

In this way we can explain the interdependence of Angerona and Volupia. The latter, despite what Saint Augustine says, is not *uoluptas*, but a personified substantive corresponding to the archaic adjective *uolup(e)*: it is the pleasure arising from a satisfied desire, a realized wish. And in this way too we can justify the definition of a Latin-Greek glossary: Angeronia (an inferior variant of Angerona) is "the goddess of the will [or of counsel?] and of opportune moments" *ἡ θεὸς τῆς βουλῆς καὶ καιρῶν*.¹⁶

This interpretation, in which an exhaustive analysis of the Roman facts is combined with the lesson of the mythologies of the two related peoples, will scandalize only those who would deny the earliest Italic peoples all intellectual agility and all traditional learning.

Although no public rite marks the summer solstice, the Romans did at least address themselves on 11 June, in the general vicinity of the solstice, to another goddess who regulates time, Mater Matuta. I have spoken of her in the "Preliminary Remarks,"¹⁷ because she is a

15. *DL*, pp. 55-64.

16. *DL*, pp. 66-69.

17. Above, pp. 50-55. The method by which Mater Matuta is treated in Latte, p. 97, n. 3, will be examined elsewhere.

typical case of those divinities who have been shrouded in mystery until now but whose singularities are all clarified by comparison with the Vedic rite. Mater Matuta is the Dawn. At her festival the Roman ladies mime her mythic actions, in the hope of making her perform them when she makes her brief appearance every day of the year. These actions are the driving out of the shades and the attentive, affectionate welcoming of the sun, the child of night—according to Vedic mythology, her sister's child. Although it has sometimes, and even quite recently, been thought otherwise, and despite a familiar allusion in the hymns to "the first dawn," Vedic religion does not seem to have included an annual Dawn festival, or anything but a daily worship of the Dawn. Likewise the plural, "the Dawns," seems to allude merely to the unending procession of Dawns throughout all time. Roman usage is different. Once every year the public rites imitate and entreat the daily activity of the goddess, and it may be thought that the great number of participants in these rites represents the dawns of the twelve months to come. The proximity of the summer solstice is not fortuitous. The Dawn goddess is of the greatest interest to men at the moment when the days, as if worn out, grow more and more slowly before starting once again to become shorter. Similarly, as we have seen, it is at the end of the disturbing process of the shortening days, at the winter solstice, that Angerona, the goddess who finally expands the days which have grown *angusti*, is of the highest interest. Moreover, C. Koch has noted that another festival, on 11 December, exactly symmetrical with the Dawn festival of 11 June, celebrated the "ancestral Sun" (Lyd. *Mens.* fragment Caseol., p. 172, ed. Wuensch). Perhaps this December festival was a preparation for the effort of the silent Angerona at the solstice.

As for the intention of the rites of the Matralia, that of the second rite may be twofold. While helping the Dawn, by their sympathetic actions, to care for the Sun, her sister's child (as Uṣas nurses and licks him), the matrons pray for their own nephews, whom they hold in their arms. The first rite supports only one interpretation. Through their mimicry, the ladies help the Dawn to chase away the shadows; nevertheless, it is possible that through a closer identification of the shadows with the unfortunate slave-woman who represents them, the social order benefits from the assured regular course of the cosmic operation. But this is an unverifiable hypothesis. The remainder of

the Dawn goddess's file is in accord with the second rite and is explained by it. As the welcomer of the newborn Sun, Mater Matuta could naturally be prayed to for fortunate births and successful confinements. In fact, in her non-Roman sanctuaries at Caere and Satricum, a quantity of votive offerings have been found representing babes in swaddling clothes, and Strabo—alone—presents the name of *Εἰλειθυία*, the midwife goddess, as the *interpretatio graeca* of the Matuta of Caere (5.2.8).

In contrast with these divinities, each of whom officially opens a fixed period of time, to which his jurisdiction is confined, Vortumnus evokes the transformation, the power of cyclical change which creates the seasons. His name is apparently good Latin: it is to *uorti* "to be turned, to be transformed" what *alumnus* "nursling" is to *ali* "to be nourished." And yet the Romans themselves insisted that he was of Etruscan origin, and modern scholars are unwilling to doubt this.¹⁸

There are good reasons for thinking that his temple on the Aventine, which contained a portrayal of M. Fulvius Flaccus in the attitude of a triumphator (Fest. p. 315 L²), had been founded by the latter after his triumph *de Vulsiniensibus* in 264 (CIL, I², 172). Even though it is not mentioned, it is possible that during the course of his campaign he had solicited or even evoked the god whom Varro (L.L. 5.46) calls *deus Etruriae princeps*. But would not this civil status be the product of a phonetic approximation? In fact, Etruria does not know Vortumnus. Outside of Rome, only very rare inscriptions mention him in Umbria (Tuder), Apulia (Canusium), on the Adriatic (Ancona), and in Cisalpine Gaul (Segusio), and none at all in Etruria. Furthermore, the goddess belonging to Volsinii seems to have borne a consonant but different name, in which the first part of the city's name can be recognized. She is *Veltune*, who presides over a scene of haruspication on a mirror. Through a transformation of the final syllable, the Romans Latinized her as *Voltumna*. Livy mentions the parleyings of the Etruscan confederation in 427 *ad fanum Voltumnae* (4.5.7–8). Could there not have been, by virtue of the consonance of the names, an assimilation of a preexisting, quite Latin god to this goddess whom the

18. Latte, pp. 191–92. See below, p. 630, n. 10, and p. 684, n. 138. On the problem *Voltumna-Vortumnus*, see the good discussion by W. Eisenhut, s.v. "Voltumna," *RE*, 2d ser. 17 (1961), cols. 852–55.

Romans hoped to acquire from their Etruscan enemies, an assimilation of the national god of the seasonal changes of nature to the goddess of Volsinii? This would explain his specific functional meaning, which is scarcely appropriate to a "city" divinity, as well as the twofold attitude of the Romans; for although they called Vortumnus Etruscan, although the courtiers of Maecenas insisted with greater or lesser emphasis on this origin, they also said that he was an old god of theirs, settled at Rome even before the city's Etruscan period; the Oscan Mamurius Veturius, Numa's legendary craftsman and the smith who forged the *ancilia*, was believed to have made the archaic statue of the god which was erected on the vicus Tuscus at the exit from the Forum, just behind the temple of Castor (Prop. 4.2.59-64). Varro (L.L. 5.74) ranks Vortumnus, along with Quirinus, Ops, Flora, etc., among the gods of the "third function," whose introduction he attributes to Titus Tatius. Whatever he was, whether indigenous or naturalized at an early date, Vortumnus completes the divine patronage of the year. Doubtless alluding to the seasonal offerings which he receives, he himself says, through the voice of Propertius (4.2.13-18):

It is for me that the first bunches of grapes turn blue, and for me the ear of grain swells with a milky juice. Here you may see the sweet cherries, the autumnal plums, the mulberries blushing under the summer sun; hither, crowned with fruits, the grafter comes to discharge his vow—those fruits which the pear tree has borne in spite of itself . . .

It is clear that Vortumnus was not an abstract personification of the flow of time. The seasons appropriate to him were the seasons of color and ripeness, summer and autumn, *autumnus*, which may owe the last syllable of its name to him. He was quite prepared to pursue and conquer the "nymph" Pomona, in the love story of the *Metamorphoses* (14.623-771).

THE PLACES

Divine protection of places is no less important to a society than that of times. In Rome Janus is on the "threshold" of both. The two *pertinaces* gods associated with Jupiter O.M. in his Capitoline temple, and before them, perhaps, the two corresponding aspects of Jupiter, conjointly guarantee Rome's permanence and stability. In short,

those portions of the ground which concern men have their own patrons, like the year, like one of the solstices and probably both, like the calendar days of the month (Calends, Nones, Ides). However, for the places, we meet with a unity of conception which the times do not show, and which is denoted by the general name *Lares*.¹⁹

By and large, the earliest Romans seem to have divided the land on which they lived, which was all that interested them, into two great contiguous and sometimes overlapping regions: one in which men normally felt themselves to be masters, and one in which they did not feel at home. The first, clearly compartmented, was the domain of *Lares* of every variety; while the second was the haunt of various gods as badly defined as the region itself, especially *Faunus*.

It is probably not necessary to search for the kind of *Lar* that was the "primitive one," as Wissowa did. In public or private religion, we find a *Lar* or *Lares* (the plural is the rule, while the singular form applies almost always only to the *Lar familiaris*) on every piece of land which is used continuously, regularly, or significantly by a man, by a group of men, or by society as a whole. Private fields and the *ager Romanus*, roads and crossroads, houses, districts, the city, and also, to judge by the formula of *deuotio*, the battlefield in time of war, even the sea as it concerns the seafarer—all have their *Lar* or *Lares*.

The name is attested without rhotacism in the song of the *Fratres Arvales*, in the form *Lases*, but there is no clear etymology (singular *Lār*, plural *Lāres*), and even the connection with *Larenta* (*Lārunda*) is not certain.²⁰ It was noted long ago that in contrast with *Penates*,

19. In addition, as everywhere, a number of specific places had patrons and patronesses whose character it is impossible to specify: thus *Palatua* at the Palatine.

20. I leave aside the difficult question of the *Mater Larum*, known only in the ritual of the *Fratres Arvales* of the imperial period and in certain notes (Festus-Paulus, Varro, and Macrobius), whose context renders them suspect of being learned speculations. In effect: (1) the very idea of a mother of the *Lares* cannot be ancient, if we grant that the mythology of Rome's historical times had eliminated filiations and that they were reintroduced only under Greek influence (above, pp. 48–50); (2) even if the *Mater Larum* were a goddess of the underworld, as many authors deduce from generously interpreted fragments of the ritual (another idea which does not seem to be ancient, below, p. 365), this would not affect the *Lares* themselves: it would not be surprising if secondarily, in the course of history, the protective spirits of portions of the ground, and of places, should have been endowed with a "chthonian" mother, when filiations had become possible once more. In short, the *Mater Larum* cannot serve as a point of departure for an exegesis of the *Lares*. The essential bibliography is: L. Ross Taylor, "The Mother of the *Lares*," *AJA*, 2d ser., 29 (1925): 299–313; E. Tabeing, *Mater Larum, zum Wesen der Larenreligion* (1932); U. Pestalozza, "Mater Larum e Acca Larentia," *Reale Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere, Rendiconti* 46 (1933): 905–60; H. Wagenvoort, *Studies in Roman Literature, Culture, and Religion* (1956), pp. 113–14 (in the article on *Orcus*, 1938).

which is regularly preceded by *dii* or *diui*, *Lares* is not an adjective but an appellative. The Greeks, who had no truly equivalent term, gave it a conjectural translation, ordinarily ἥρωες (whence *Lar Aeneas*),²¹ occasionally δαίμονες.

In country or city houses, the *Lar* or *Lares* are associated with other protectors, the *Penates*, but whereas the latter are specifically the guardians of the master of the house and his kindred, the *Lar* provides indiscriminate protection for all the members of the household, free or slave, for the whole *familia*, whence his name *Lar familiaris* (rather than *Lares familiares*). This seems to be a general characteristic: whatever his place may be, the *Lar* is called upon to protect all the human beings in it, and men concern him as dwellers in or users of his domain. As a result, the slave class and the lower free classes found religious shelter in this cult, and occasionally an element of political power.²² Even in domestic life, the essentially local significance of the *Lar*—which becomes, in the last century of the Republic, a common synonym for “house, dwelling place”—appears in many circumstances. The first care of the *pater familias* arriving at his *uilla*, his country house, is to greet the *Lar familiaris* (Cato Agr. 2). Plautus’s characters pray to him when they leave on a voyage (Mil. 1339), or inform him that they are going to find *alium Larem*, *aliam urbem*, *aliam ciuitatem* (Merc. 836–37)—and at the same time they invoke the *Lares* of the road, *ut me bene tutetis* (Merc. 865). They sacrifice to him—indoors, *quum intro aduenero*—when a member of the family who was believed lost returns to the fold (Rud. 1206–7). They pray to him when they settle into a new house, *ut nobis haec habitatio bona fausta felix fortunataque eueniat* (Trin. 39–41). The young wife places an *as*, which she carries on her foot, on the altar of the *Lares familiares*, and another, inside a purse, at the crossroads, the place of worship of the *Lares* of the district (Varro, in Non., p. 852 L), signifying the two aspects of the settlement. Death, the great departure, involves a sacrifice, *piaculum*, to the *Lar familiaris* (Cic. Leg. 2.55). In the prologue to the *Aulularia*, the *Lar familiaris* gives a good, short summation, in two verbs, of the theory of his function: *hanc domum iam multos annos est quom possideo et colo*.

21. See below, pp. 452–53.

22. W. Warde Fowler, “The Origin of the *Lar Familiaris*,” in *Roman Essays and Interpretations* (1920), pp. 56–64, even thought that primitively the *Lar* had no connection with the house and that he was introduced with the slaves; this is certainly mistaken.

In the country, the principal place of worship of the Lares, properly *agri custodes*, is the crossroads, *compitum*. Here a synthesis is made of the fields, of the adjoining properties, and of the whole district, which meets here for certain deliberations (Isid. *Etym.* 15.2.15); probably here too, as happens in many folklores, society is in delicate communication with the gods of "the brushwood," the alarming spirits which haunt crossroads. Little towers are built here, with as many doors as there are adjacent farms, and at the edge of each of these farms, facing the tower, an altar is set up, so that each property-owner may sacrifice with his feet on his own land. Here are celebrated the Compitalia, a movable feast, generally held in the very first days of January, and in any case shortly after the Saturnalia of December. The establishment of this feast of the *pagani* was attributed to the king-censor Servius Tullius, probably because a venerable rite, for which there is an equivalent in the Vedic books, introduces in these feasts a rough form of census-taking. In his account of the establishment, after describing the crossroads chapels, Dionysius of Halicarnassus (4.14.3) records only this practice: "...and he ordered [the neighboring property-holders] by law to offer sacrifices every year to the *Lares Compitales*, with each house bringing an offering of pancakes." To this census by household was added another, individual enumeration, in which, as always in the domain of the Lares, slaves were regarded as having the same claims as free men. Paulus (p. 343 L²) mentions the hanging of balls (*pilae*) and of male and female dolls (*effigies*; Macr. 1.7.34, *maniae*) in the crossroads chapel (Macrobius: in front of the door of each house), the number of balls being that of the slaves and the number of dolls that of the free men. The feast was a *lustratio* (Prop. 4.1.23), and through the *pilae* and *maniae* men individually "redeemed themselves" or even thought of the balls and dolls as surrogates for a human sacrifice.²³

These two examples, which are the best known, are enough to illustrate the general nature of the Lares, of whom Wissowa said in 1894, amending Jordan, "there are no Lares of persons or of groups of persons, and the representation of the Lares is always associated with a place" (*RL*, II, 2, col. 1890, 49-52).²⁴ However, a third specific case

23. "QII. 10 ('Offrandes et dénombrement au carrefour')," *Lat.* 20 (1961): 262-65. On the Compitalia and the Paganalia, see L. Delatte, *Recherches sur quelques fêtes mobiles du calendrier romain* (1937), pp. 43-48.

24. Against the explanation of the Lares as arising from the cult of ancestors (Samter) see Latte, p. 94 and n. 1 (bibliography).

should be mentioned: the *Lares Praestites* of Rome itself, that is, of the ground of the city as it is occupied and utilized by the inhabitants. The fifty-first *Roman Question* is devoted to them, as well as a brilliant passage in the *Fasti* (5.129-48). A representation on a coin confirms and illustrates these texts, both of which doubtless derive from Varro (Latte, p. 94). These Lares are young people, armed with a spear, covered with a sheepskin, and accompanied by a dog. In spite of what some scholars have said, not everything in this portrayal is Greek. It is probable that these guardians and their dog watched over Rome as a *Prestota* watched over Iguvium. In an ingenious collection of feeble etymologies, Ovid defines them (135-36):

*stant quoque nobis, et praesunt moenibus urbis,
et sunt praesentes auxiliumque ferunt.*

According to the same poet, an altar had been consecrated to them on a first day of May. As for the moral values which, according to Plutarch, "certain Romans" attributed to them, they can only be a product of the scholarly imagination: "Just as the philosophers of the school of Chrysippus believe that there is a circle of lesser demons whom the gods use as public tormentors against impious and unjust men, could not the Lares be demons of the type of the Erinnyes, charged with punishing and with watching over morals and households?"

Although they are in a certain sense opposed to the peaceable Lares, Faunus and Silvanus are not entirely separable from them. How could it be otherwise? It seems indeed that these gods—and the name *Siluanus* is clear enough—presided over lands which were less domesticated but still accessible enough to interest and serve men. Neither the brushwood, nor the *terrae incognitae*, nor foreign parts, with their great and uncontrollable dangers,²⁵ but the nearby woodland, the countryside itself, considered not in the outlines of the farms which exploit it but as a whole, as a world to itself with its own surprises, its terrors, its rutting odors, its hidden forces of fertility. It is a more substantial, more concrete countryside than that of the Lares, and it is defined by a total opposition to the city. Faunus is *agrestis*

25. Wherein they are distinguished from the homologous Vedic god, Rudra, on whom see below, pp. 418-20.

(Ov. *F.* 2.193; 3.315; etc.), with all the shades of meaning which that word carries. But, by offering sacrifices and taking certain precautions, the countryfolk know how to use these gods of the wild, who multiply their livestock, fertilize their fields, and provide them with the pasturage of the forest.²⁶ A time will even come when Silvanus will docilely let himself be placed in the group of protector-gods which already included the Penates and the Lares.²⁷ The *Faunus Nympharum fugientum amator* of Horace's charming ode (3.18), with his wintertime rustic festival, is similarly tamed:

. . . in festal garb the country folk make holiday amid the meads, along with resting steers; the wolf saunters among lambs that know no fear; in thy honour the forest sheds its woodland foliage; . . .

From his native wildness, Faunus preserves certain incorrigible traits. As he is lewd and on occasion uses a female animal instead of a nymph, he is called "Inuus," which Servius (*Aen.* 6.775) explains: *ab ineundo passim cum omnibus animalibus*. Like certain spirits in modern folklore, he appears to the peasants in the outlying fields (Probus ad Verg. *Georg.* 1.10), but he also torments and bullies them; during the night he is an incubus who troubles their dreams (Plin. *N.H.* 25.29; etc.). As *Fatuus* or *Fatuclus* (Serv. *Aen.* 6.775; etc.) he is the source of the mysterious, ultimately meaningful voices of nature. From the depths of the forest he causes the announcement of a victory to be heard (Dion. 5.16.2; etc.), and he pronounces oracles. To Latinus, lying on the skin of a freshly sacrificed sheep, he reveals in a dream one of the three *fata* which together form the basis of the second half of the *Aeneid* (7.81-106). In consequence, when the scholars get hold of him, he too will receive his Greek interpretation: he will become Pan.

It is generally thought with some likelihood that Silvanus is only one of the aspects of Faunus, *siluicola Faunus* (Verg. *Aen.* 10.551). However, he is clearly differentiated from that lascivious god by his antipathy to women (Schol. in Juvenalem 6.447; Wiss., p. 214). *Horridus* (Hor.

26. For the *templum Fauni*, built in 196 by the plebeian aediles and dedicated two years later, the costs were covered by fines imposed on three dishonest pasture farmers, Liv. 33.42.10; 34.53.3. As is natural, the *multationes* of *pecuarii* were specially used to erect temples to the rural and agricultural divinities, Flora, Ceres, and Faunus (Bömer, *Fast.* ad 2.193).

27. Inscriptions collected in Wiss., p. 214, n. 11.

Carm. 3.29.23; Mart. 10.92.6; etc.), bearded, *florentes ferulas et grandia lilia quassans* (Verg. *Ecl.* 10.25), carrying a young uprooted cypress as a staff (Verg. *Georg.* 1.20), he nonetheless places, in association with Mars, his woodland at the disposal of Cato's farmers. Better yet: he does not move away when that woodland is transformed by colonization into cultivable land, and paradoxically he becomes the god of the villa, of agricultural exploitation, *aruorum pecorisque deus* (Verg. *Aen.* 8.601). According to Horace (*Ep.* 2.1.143), at harvest time the peasants of the olden days *Tellurem porco Siluanum lacte piabant*. He also encroaches upon the duties of Terminus—Horace calls him *tutor finium* (*Epod.* 2.22)—and he receives the same offerings as Vortumnus (Tib. 1.1.13–14):

... And all the fruits which the new year produces for me are the offering which I lay at the feet of the god of the fields.

Occasionally he is a kind of hairier Lar. An inscription from the region of Benevento offers thanks for a safe return to a *Silvanus casanicus* (CIL, IX, 2100), exactly as the *Lar(es) cas(anici)* are thanked at another nearby point in Samnium (ibid. 725).

His cult, like that of the Lares, can be engaged in by any member of the *familia*, free or slave (Cato *Agr.* 83), and indeed there are numerous epigraphic testimonies to the devotion of slaves and the gratitude of freedmen to Silvanus.²⁸

Once a year, for one day, the balance between the ordered, explored, compartmented world and the savage, untamed world was upset, when Faunus took possession of everything. This happened on 15 February, in the second half of the month in which, through the Feralia on the twenty-first, a necessary but disturbing connection between two other worlds was established, that of the living and that of the dead. Marking the end of winter and the approach of spring and of the "new year," by the ancient reckoning of ten months, these days were a ritual renewal of the very frameworks of the social and cosmic order. Rites of liquidation and rites of preparation were here intermingled as they gathered strength from their common source, the world which lies beyond man's daily experience.²⁹

28. On the triple Silvanus custos, see Delatte, *Recherches sur quelques fêtes mobiles* ..., p. 43, n. 5.

29. A. Brelich, "Februarius," in *Tre variazioni romane*, pp. 95–125.

On the morning of the fifteenth, a brotherhood of strange celebrants took possession of the approaches to the Palatine. They were called the *Luperci*. This name certainly contains the word for wolf, but the formation is not clear; perhaps it is an expressive derivative of the type of *nou-er-ca* (as Mommsen, Jordan, and Otto think),³⁰ rather than a compound of *lupus* and *arcere* (Preller, Wissowa, and Deubner), for there is nothing in the rites which is directed against wolves. The celebrants formed two teams, which legend connects with Romulus and Remus, and the names of which are those of two *gentes*, *Luperci Quinctiales* and *Luperci Fabiani*. Very probably, however, they were directed by a single *magister*, and associated in their single annual performance.³¹ Without any clothing except a goatskin around their hips, they represented those spirits of nature of which Faunus, the god of the festival, was the leader. Cicero (*Cacl.* 26) defines them as "the wild sodality, wholly pastoral and rustic, of the brothers Luperci, whose woodland gathering was instituted before human civilization and the laws." This is obviously a translation of a conceptual structure into historical terms. On the day of the Lupercalia, the *humanitas* and the *leges* of the city gave way before the *siluestre* and *agreste*. Closely connected with the Palatine hill, the festival was certainly known to the very earliest Romans.

One noun recurs frequently in the somewhat confused accounts of the Lupercalia. It is the noun *februum*, from which the month of February received its name. *Februum*, which Varro (*L.L.* 6.13) translates as "purgamentum," and the verb *februare* "to purify" (*Lyd. Mens.* 4.20, based on the pontifical books), had a more extensive

30. However, the linguists, notably E. Benveniste, *Origines de la formation des noms en indo-européen* 1 (1935): 29, divide the word differently: **nou-er* + *ca-* (cf. Greek *véapos*, Armenian *nor*). J. S. T. Hanssen, "Latin Diminutives," *Årbok Universitet Bergen*, 1951, pp. 98-99, thinks it is a back-formation based on *luperca*, the diminutive of *lupa*, and that it is also influenced by the name of the *Mamerci*. J. Gruber, in *Glotta* 39 (1961): 273-76, suggests **lupo-sequos* "qui lupum sequitur." On the Lupercalia, see A. Kirsopp Michels, "The Topography and Interpretation of the Lupercalia," *TAPhA* 84 (1953): 35-39 (copious bibliography in the first note), and Latte, pp. 84-87 and notes. K. Kerényi "Wolf und Ziege am Fest der Lupercalia," *Mélanges Marouzeau* (1948), pp. 309-17 (= *Niobe*, 1949, pp. 136-47), thinks that the Luperci were ambivalent, representing at the same time the wolves (the original form, coming from the north) and the goats (influence from the south). Concerning the flagellation, extending Mannhardt's famous chapter "Der Schlag mit der Lebensrute," see J. Ejdestam, "Piskning med ris vid årshögtider," *Folkminnen och Folktnskar* 17 (1940): 52-81. A. Alföldi, *Die trojanischen Urnahmen der Römer* (Rektorsprogramm der Universität Basel für das Jahr 1956) (1957), p. 24, sees in the *luperci* the remains of the "Männerbund" which he places at the origin of the Roman state.

31. See below, pp. 591-92.

usage than the rites of 15 February, but these were their principal place of application. According to Servius, the ancients specially called the goat hide by the name *februum* (Aen. 8.343), and Varro (L.L. 6.34) explains *Februarius a die februato* (cf. Plut. Rom. 21.7; Ov. F. 2.31-32) "because then the people *februatur*, that is, the old Palatine town girt with flocks of people 'is purified,' *lustratur*, by the naked Luperci." Some of the ceremonies were rites of purification, others rites of fertility, but it is not always possible to distinguish the two intentions. Several of them remain enigmatic, for example, the one which only Plutarch reports (Rom. 21.10): "... The priests [doubtless the Luperci] slaughter goats, and then, after two youths of noble birth have been brought to them, some of them touch their foreheads with a bloody knife, and others wipe the stain off at once with wool dipped in milk. The youths must laugh after their foreheads are wiped." The text does not make clear whether the two young boys themselves belong to the sodality. The sacrifice of a dog is also mentioned (Plut. Rom. 21.13; Q.R. 111); this can be easily explained if the Luperci "are" wolves, less easily if they are "dispellers of wolves." But the essential point of the rites is clear, and a number of authors have described it in a consistent fashion. After the sacrifice of an unknown number of goats, the Luperci girded themselves with the skins stripped from the victims (Justin. 43.1.7; etc.); a lavish meal followed, washed down by plenty of wine (Val. Max. 2.2.9, in the legend of the foundation), and then began the purifying race all around the Palatine, starting from and returning to the place called Lupercal. While running, the Luperci waved goatskin thongs, and by striking with these thongs the people whom they met, especially women, they guaranteed their fertility (Plut. Rom. 21.11-12; etc.). Plutarch (Caes. 61.2) and Juvenal (2.142) mitigate the violence of the flagellation, saying that the Roman ladies simply held out their hands for the blows of the priests; but, as Frazer says (Fast. 2: 388), "for the purpose of impregnation it can have made very little difference whether the stripes were administered to the hands or to the back."³²

32. The rite is certainly represented on a mosaic calendar of the third century A.D., H. Stern, "Un calendrier illustré de Thysdrus," *Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei* 365 (1968): 177-200, esp. p. 181 and pl. III 2. The young Lupercus is dressed there like another one on a Vatican stele (Hadrian's time), published by P. Veyne, "L'iconographie de la *Transvectio equitum* et des Lupercalia," *REA* 62 (1960): 160-61, and pl. IX (cf. p. 105 and pl. VIII 3).

To justify this practice, Ovid tells a story which does not seem to be his own invention and which relocates it in the theology of Faunus-Inuus (F. 2.425-52). After the rape of the Sabine women, he says, the gods inflicted an almost total sterility on these violently obtained wives. Romulus is angered at seeing his plan thwarted. "What boots it me to have ravished the Sabine women," he exclaims, "if the wrong I did has brought me not strength but only war?" The men and women then go to pray in a grove consecrated to Juno, who causes her voice to be heard through the trees:

"Italidas matres" inquit "sacer hircus inito."

"Let a sacred goat penetrate the women of Italy!" A fresh perplexity was created by this monstrous command: how could the Roman women agree to be "penetrated" (cf. *Inuus*) by a goat—even if *sacer hircus* is the correct reading, and not the other, *caper hirtus*? An Etruscan soothsayer solves the puzzle: he immolates a goat, cuts its skin into thongs, and tells the young women to offer their backs to his blows—and nine months later Lucina is so busy that she did not know where to turn.

Such is the meaning which emerges from these rites. However, in primitive times the Luperci seem to have been involved, no less brutally, in another order of social realities. In these weeks during which everything must be confirmed, the royal power benefited from the rites.³³ Otherwise it would be hard to understand why Caesar, developing the plan which was intended to lead him to the *regnum*, should have added to the two traditional teams a third, the *Luperci Julii*, composed of dedicated men, which was a first rough draft of the imperial cult (Suet. *Caes.* 76; Cass. Dio 44.6.2; 45.30.2). It would be just as hard to understand why the experiment which he organized with the help of Mark Antony to find out how the people would react to his being crowned king should have been made on the occasion of the Lupercalia, during the race itself (Plut. *Caes.* 61.2-3).

33. This is one of the few points in the Roman chapter of my book *Le problème des centaures* (1929) which are still valid. Granted the judgment expressed by A. Ernout in the latest edition (1959) of the *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*, still signed A. Ernout and A. Meillet, s.v. *februus*, I am obliged to say that the publication of the phonetic comparison of *februo-* and *gandharvā-* was thrust upon me by Meillet himself, who had taken a great interest in the book. In a final note (19 March 1929), shortly before publication, he wrote me, "*Le februus dont je suis responsable ne me pèse pas; il est assez joli et je souhaite qu'il vous porte chance.*"

What could be the meaning of this strange picture, the consul-Lupercus, stark naked, bursting from the throng of runners and leaping to the tribune to crown Caesar, if it were not the reconstruction of an ancient scene capable of capturing the imagination of the people and neutralizing the republican mystique? If it had not been so, would the spectators have understood so readily the political importance of the gesture? However, our information dates from an era in which we can no longer hope to obtain a complete and systematic view of rites which had long ceased to correspond to religious and social reality.

Did this group of savage divinities include in ancient times, a feminine element? Fauna is hardly more than a name, which takes on substance only in legends where, as wife, daughter, or sister of Faunus, she passed into fiction, and into the Hellenized novel. Under the name of Bona Dea, she was the object of an annual ceremonial in December which was official but secret—strictly limited to women—highly colored, but Greek. She is no more than a “Damia,” probably imported from Tarentum, and perhaps through a mistranslation, when that city was conquered in 272. As for “Lupercæ,” one does not know what to make of the Valeria Luperca of Falerii, of whom the thirty-fifth of the *Parallela Minora* speaks, “following Aristides, in the nineteenth book of his History of Italy.”³⁴ The first part of the anecdote is pure fantasy, but the conclusion may reflect a local rite. The town being ravaged by an epidemic, Valeria Luperca, chosen by lot to be sacrificed, then miraculously rescued, as young girls occasionally are in Greek legend, takes a hammer no less miraculously provided by heaven and goes from house to house, lightly tapping the sick whom she finds there and telling them all that they are cured. The author adds that this “mystery” is still celebrated. Thus it is a question of a *lustratio*, but with a different orientation than at Rome.

If there is no clearly marked boundary on the earth's surface between the wild world and the domesticated world, with the latter constantly encroaching on the former; if there is likewise no clear demarcation between the earth's surface and the sky, between men

34. Most recently, T. Köves, “Valeria Luperca,” *Hermes* 90 (1962): 214–38, with the earlier bibliography; the author tries to correlate the actions of V. L. with what is known of the cult of the Faliscan Juno (*Ov. Am.* 3.13; *Dion.* 1.21; above, p. 297).

and the *di superi* to whom the smoke of the altars constantly bears the offerings of men, the situation is otherwise between the earth's surface and the nether world. Communication is less easy, and less wished for. When the earth of its own accord opens an abyss toward its depths, it is a public disaster, for which only the self-sacrifice of the gallant Curtius provides a remedy. The approach which men have dug, where certain Roman scholars saw the altar belonging to the *inferi* gods, is strictly controlled. Three times a year, on 28 August, 5 October, and 8 November, *mundus patet* (Fest. p. 273 L²).

The idea of *mundus* is one of the most highly controverted in Roman religion. The ancient authors seem in fact to have mingled several traditions, and even to have confused several rites and several places, and the moderns have added their own arbitrary choices or their extrapolations. In 1930 S. Weinstock,³⁵ and in 1958 H. Le Bonniec,³⁶ put this confused dossier into a reasonable state of order. Here is how we can circumvent the difficulties today.

Not every ditch, not every subterranean place of worship anywhere, is a *mundus*. In particular, the altar of Consus, in the Circus, is not one:³⁷ the cause of its being under the earth is that the god presides over the preservation of grain in granaries which themselves are or have been underground, but in fact it still belongs on the surface level, which is at the disposition of men.

The term *mundus*, which was called to such a far-reaching destiny, was reserved for two things, or types of things. On the one hand, the ditch, closed forever, into which, at the time of the foundation of the city, Romulus, following a ritual which was said to be Etruscan, had thrown the "first-fruits of all things the use of which was sanctioned by custom as good and by nature as necessary," and in addition a bit of the soil of the country from which each of his companions came (Plut. *Rom.* 11.1-4; Ov. *F.* 4.821-24). On the other hand, a trench (or several?) which gave access to that subterranean world of which the ancient Romans do not seem to have made any coherent representations. The principal one, perhaps the only one, according to Festus, was "that which is called the *Cereris mundus*" (p. 261 L²).

35. "Mundus patet," *RM* 45 (1930): 111-23, with the earlier bibliography; cf. E. Täubler, *Terramare und Rom* (1932), p. 43 and n.

36. *Le culte de Cérès à Rome* (1958), pp. 175-84.

37. See below, p. 661, n. 81.

This designation, which is confirmed by the existence at Capua of a *sacerdos Cerialis mundalis* (CIL, X, 3926), corresponds to a localization: the *mundus* was in *sacro Cereris*, which probably means in an annex of the temple of the goddess. This was the trench which was normally closed and opened only on three days of the year. Another passage in Festus (p. 273 L²) presents it in these terms:

... Cato, in his Commentaries on civil law, gives the following explanation of this name: the *mundus* owes its name to the *mundus* (vault of heaven) which is above us; actually, as I have been able to learn from those who have entered it, it has a shape similar to that of the other *mundus*. As for its lower part, which is so to speak consecrated to the *dii Manes*, our ancestors decided that it should remain closed at all times, save on the days indicated above. These days they regarded as *religiosi* for the following reason: at the moment when the secrets of the religion of the *dii Manes* were so to speak brought to light and uncovered, they wished no official act to be performed. Likewise, on these days one did not engage in combat with the enemy, nor levy troops, nor hold comitia, and no official activity was entered upon, save in cases of extreme necessity.

Mrs. L. Banti and Latte have emphasized that in actual practice these prescriptions were not followed, during the centuries which we know about, especially with respect to the comitia (the calendars mark the three days with the initial C[omitialis]), but this is no reason for disputing the theory. Festus, that is, Verrius Flaccus, speaks in the past tense, in the imperfect, thus signifying that the usage had not been kept pure.

On the other hand, the expression by which he defines the state of affairs created by the opening of the *mundus* three times a year is interesting for what it says and also for what it does not say: *quo tempore ea quae occultae et abditae religionis deorum Manium essent, ueluti in lucem quandam adducerentur et patefierent*. It is not a question of a mass raising of the dead, which takes place in another season, the Feralia of February, during the "crisis" of the end of winter, but merely of a kind of public revealing of certain shadowy secrets. Unfortunately it is impossible for us to determine the nature of these secrets. Varro's phrase, preserved by Macrobius (1.16.18), says the same thing, *mundus cum patet deorum tristium et inferum quasi ianuam patet*, but without giving any further indication of what actually happens, is done, or is shown through this very narrow gate. Finally,

Macrobius's other explanation (1.16.17) specifies, but in Greek terms, that the danger is rather that of descent than of ascent: it was not fitting to begin a war when the *mundus* was open, because it was consecrated to Dispat(er) and Proserpina, and because it seemed better to go into battle when Pluto's jaws were closed.

It is not possible to reconstruct that which our informants themselves no longer understood and about which, on the whole, they said very little. Etymology is of no assistance: the word *mundus* is not explained by Indo-European.³⁸

The *di penates* received their name from a particular place: the *penus*, the chamber for provisions. However, as they do not especially watch over the good condition or the abundance of these provisions, but generally over the well-being of the house and its inhabitants, it is probable that *penus*, in this derivative, is to be understood as "the most intimate part, the center," a meaning which is attested by the related and certainly ancient adverb, *penitus*, and by the words *penetrare* and *penetralia*.³⁹ In any case, it is from this theoretical "center" that the activity of the Penates radiated.

The hearth is one of the places where the members of the household enter most readily into communication with them. Even here, though, the imperfect differentiation between the collective designations *Lares* and *Penates* has caused the two groups to be regarded as rivals or to be confused. Servius (*Aen.* 11.211) says *ara deorum penatium est focus*, and Virgil, in connection with *penus*, even uses their name for *focus* (*et flammis adolere penates*, *Aen.* 1.703), but Cato (*Agr.* 143), Plautus (*Trin.* 139), and other authors attribute the same hearth to the *Lar familiaris* or identify it with him. The two ideas are actually close neighbors: one refers to the place, the other to the construction which is found there. A third rival, Vesta, is present, but is seldom named,

38. However, see E. Evangelisti, "Una congruenza lessicale latino-indiana (a proposito del *mundus* sotterraneo)," *Studi linguistici in onore di V. Pisani* (1969), pp. 347-66.

39. Cf. the fine explanation of Festus (p. 356 L²) s.v. *penetrale sacrificium*. P. Boyancé, "Les Pénates dans l'ancienne religion romaine," *REA* 54 (1952): 112-13, rightly doubts, against Wissowa, that the Penates were properly the gods of the provisions closet; this clears up the difficulty which occurs in passing from such gods to the *Di patrii*, or even, in reverse, from the *Di patrii* to these gods. On pages 114-15 Boyancé gives a good criticism of the hypothesis of F. Bömer, *Rom und Troja* (1951) (second study, on the Trojan Penates), according to whom the figurines found in old Alban tombs were "Mediterranean gods," in contrast with the unrepresented gods of the Indo-European invaders.

perhaps because she originally belonged to public cult.⁴⁰ The Penates themselves were surely promoted from private to public cult, where, during the republican period, they failed to play a great role. The conjunction of Vesta and the *di penates* nevertheless created between them an actual solidarity: Cicero is right when he says (*Nat. d.* 2.68), *nec longe absunt ab hac ui* (sc. *Vestae*) *di penates*; and it is in the *aedes Vestae*, which is also provided with a *penus*, that the conception of "the Penates of the Roman people" was developed: among the sanctuaries burned under Nero at the time of the great fire, Tacitus mentions *delubrum Vestae cum penatibus populi Romani* (*Ann.* 15.41). The abode of the Penates in the hearth is confirmed by a rite. Before every meal, when the family is gathered around the table, a full bowl is placed on the hearth, or a part of the meal is thrown into the fire, for *dii* who can only be the Penates, and the diners remain silent until the slave has declared "the gods" to be satisfied (*Serv. Aen.* 1.730). Later they customarily received a chapel in the atrium. But this does not prevent them from being allotted the *culina*, the kitchen, in the doubtless artificial apportionment of the diverse parts of the house among diverse divinities (*Serv. Aen.* 2.469).

Wissowa observed that the name *Penates*, in contrast with *Lares*, is only an adjective which needs to be preceded by the substantive "gods." Their personality is reduced to their localization; they are "those of the *penus*," as the Arpinates are the citizens of Arpinum. For a long time the Romans were satisfied with this designation, but then they regarded as Penates all the gods, masculine or feminine, who were honored in the house for whatever reason. *Penates sunt*, says Servius (*Aen.* 2.514), *omnes dei qui domi coluntur*. In this way the conception was reached to which the famous paintings of Pompeii bear witness: each householder felt free to choose from the pantheon the divinities he wished as *di penates*, a title which designated no more than a function which was open to the most diverse candidates—including the most distinguished gods, Jupiter, Venus, Fortuna, etc. And there was no limit to this: Wissowa stressed the fact that the ritual oath of the magistrates, which had to be sworn by Jupiter and by the *di penates* (and in addition, under the Empire, by the Genius of the reigning emperor as well as by his predecessors who were already *diui*), occurs once, in Lusitania, transformed as follows:

40. Above, pp. 311–26; for the opposite view, Latte, p. 90.

Juppiter O.M. ac diuus Augustus ceterique omnes di immortales (CIL, II, 172). On the other hand, and perhaps this derives from an unattested feature of the ancient conception, the "paired" form appears in these diverse extensions. The paintings at Pompeii most often distribute the gods of such diverse natures whom they "penatize" in groups of two. As for the *Penates publici*, when for the first time, in the third century, the Roman state raised a special temple for them on a slope of the Velia, they were portrayed there as two young people of the type of the Dioscuri. Dionysius of Halicarnassus saw them with his own eyes (1.68.1): "In this temple there are images of the Trojan gods which it is lawful for all to see, with an inscription showing them to be the Penates. They are two seated youths holding spears, and are pieces of ancient workmanship." A number of coins of the first century likewise bore heads of the Dioscuri with the inscription *D(i) P(enates) P(ublici)*. It must not be concluded that the public Penates are the Dioscuri. Probably they merely borrowed their figuration from these gods. However, for this to be possible, there must have been something in them which suggested the Greek twins; perhaps this was simply their association as a pair.⁴¹ It is true that Varro (L.L. 5.58) did not admit that the gods of the Velia were really the Penates; he saved this name for certain mysterious objects which were preserved in the *penus Vestae*—so mysterious and inaccessible that the ancients formed all kinds of suppositions concerning them, which are without interest here.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus calls them "Trojan gods." In fact they were annexed to the Trojan legend. Aeneas is supposed to have brought them from Asia, thus assuring the continuity and even the identity of the two cities. Intermediate stages which were furnished by other traditions and which the new legend was bound to respect, such as Lavinium and Alba, intervened between Aeneas and Romulus. Rome thus felt directly interested in the Penates of these cities, or at least of the first, the only one to survive. It regarded them, like the local Vesta, as identical with its own (Varr. L.L. 5.144; Plut. *Cor.* 29.2), and every year when the consuls took office they went to the neighboring city in order to sacrifice to these divinities (Macr. 3.4.11; Serv. *Aen.* 2.296; etc.).

41. C. Peyre, "Castor et Pollux et les Pénates pendant la période républicaine," *MEFR* 74 (1962): 433-62.

4

MAN

THE LIVING

In each religion, in all periods, there exist groups of representations which allow or even invite incoherence, both because they are naturally fluid and are applied only to the invisible part of existence, and because they mix readily with foreign representations, which are themselves unstable. The most important of these groups concerns the vegetative, affective, and reflective life of man, and also his after-life. What is it that causes man to be alive, to feel, and to think? What composes each man's "I" and what accompanies it? And when he dies, what subsists of the parts or of the accompaniments of his "I"? The ethnographers know: it is a labor of Sisyphus to establish the "psychology" of an American or African tribe. Just when one thinks that one has enumerated the souls which are attributed to the individual, and that one has determined their respective roles and their names, one hears a phrase or notices an account in which the same names are used with other meanings, or in which one of the souls is missing from the roll-call. The ethnographers, whether missionary or lay, also know how difficult it is for them not to introduce into their observations the categories of their own religion or of the textbooks with which they began their studies. As for ideas concerning the dead, it is hardly necessary to leave Europe. The tombs decorated with flowers at the beginning of November show clearly enough that our imagination still believes that under the stone there remains something of those whom our faith locates in Purgatory or in Paradise. It was not otherwise at Rome, doubtless from the very earliest times. If we pretend to systematize completely and to put in chronological order the contradictory data which we read concerning these matters,

we are certain, beforehand, to fall into arbitrary conclusions. The first idea to present itself, that of *Genius*, has given rise to many such imprudent conclusions.

Since the word "soul" has been used, it is necessary first of all to remark that none of the terms in which we might think of discovering some part of our ideas about the soul, *animus*, *anima*, *mens*, *ingenium*, has any religious significance. When Plautus writes, concerning a feast, *facite uostro animo uolup* (Cas. 784) or even, regarding Jupiter's abundant love affairs, *recte facit, animo quando obsequitur suo* (Amph. 995), the *animus* which is thus gratified is hardly more than a reflexive pronoun.

However, in Plautus's cheerful expressions *animus* has a doublet, *Genius*. To the parasite who waits in vain for the banquet which he had expected, the recalcitrant victim replies: *hic quidem Genium meliorem tuum non facies* (Stich. 622); *Genio suo multa bona facere* is to spend heavily for one's pleasure (Pers. 263); and the miser Euclio, in despair at the loss of his money box, almost regrets having guarded it so jealously: "I robbed myself of it, I, my *animus* and my *Genius*, and now others are profiting from it for their pleasure and at my expense" (Aul. 724-26). Is *Genius* then the soul, my soul? But the parasites of the same Plautus like to name the man who entertains them *Genius meus* (*tuum gnatum et Genium meum*, Capt. 879; *ecquis est qui mihi commonstret Phaedromum Genium meum?* Curc. 301; *teneo dextera Genium meum*, Men. 138). Is it then the source of life? But notions of morality are involved: *quod ego per hanc te dextram oro et Genium tuum, per tuam fidem . . .*, we read in Terence (Andr. 289). Guardian angel? One thinks of the beginning of Horace's definition (Ep. 2.2.183): *Genius, natale comes qui temperat astrum*. Does it die with the man? Yes, if one believes what follows in Horace's definition, *naturae deus humanae mortalis*; no, if one listens to what his contemporary Ovid says of Aeneas (F. 2.545): *ille patris Genio sollemnia tura ferebat*. We must guard against trying to resolve these contradictions. They are a part of the material itself, they are expected, and they prove nothing against the intelligence of the Romans.

Since antiquity the etymology of the word, clear in its root, less clear in its derivation, has given rise to various opinions concerning the profound nature of the *Genius*, and the discussion has been pursued by the moderns. Does the root *gen-* (*gigno*, archaically also *geno*)¹

1. H. Wagenvoort, "Genius a genendo," *Mnem.*, 4th ser., 4 (1951): 163-68.

have here an active or a passive force, does it mean "to engender" or "to be born"? In the former case, are we to understand "qui gignit" ("qui gignere solet": Birt), or "qui genuit"? In both cases, what is the subject—who engenders, or who is born? Another discussion, which has been mentioned earlier, interferes with this one. In the beginnings, did the Genius occur in women as well as in men, or was it confined to men, with the women having their own Juno? Despite W. F. Otto's excellent critique (*RE* 7 [1912], cols. 1157–58), the majority of recent authors assert that the pairing of Genius and Juno is ancient and conclude (on this point Latte makes no changes in Wissowa's views) that in primitive times Genius designated "die spezifische Manneskraft," "the specific power of the male," the faculty of engendering, as opposed to the feminine character and the faculty of giving birth over which Juno Lucina presided. Thus Genius is "qui gignit," and a confirmation of this is allegedly found in the name of the conjugal bed, *lectus genialis*.

We have seen above the reasons which suggest the opposite view, that the introduction of Juno into this matter was recent, appreciably later than Plautus, and also those which argue against reducing the earliest Juno to a patroness merely of the physiological functions of women.² As for the meaning itself of Genius, an archaic substantive of a rare type, it is not so certain that it is active. The compound *ingenium*, which belongs to a more usual type but which is also definitely ancient, has only one passive meaning, along with the active verb *ingignere* "to cause to be born in." Speaking of the instinct for preservation, Cicero says (*Nat. d.* 2.124) *tantam ingenuit animantibus conseruandi sui natura custodiam* and, speaking of another instinct deemed to be nobler (*Fin.* 2.46), *natura cupiditatem homini ingenuit ueri uidendi*. More materially Lucan will write (6.439): *herbasque nocentes rupibus ingenuit tellus*. And yet *ingenium* is not "that which causes to be born in, that which inculcates," "quod ingignit," but "property, innate quality (or: character, temperament)," "quod ingenitum est." If there were an inanimate **Genium*, it would have the same meaning, but without the nuance suggested by *in-*, "quod genitum est," "the physical and moral sum of that which has just been born." *Genius*, in the animate gender, is just that, personalized and to a considerable degree divinized.

2. Above, pp. 292–94.

The name of the Genius, thus separated from that of Juno and corrected in its etymology, corresponds closely to what it is in reality. *Genius est deus*, says Censorinus (3.1), *cuius in tutela ut quisque natus est uiuit*. And Otto (col. 1159, line 45–col. 1160, line 23) has justly remarked that if Genius was “qui gignit,” we should expect to find it in the current language, in the works of the comic authors, involved in the sexual life. This never happens, whereas expressions of the type *Genio indulgere* are regularly applied to the pleasures of the table, and the Genius appears frequently in the scenes featuring parasites. Well before the idea of “person” was clearly distinguished in law, it was Genius, in religion, which approached it most closely. Again it is Otto who has emphasized (col. 1158, lines 15–28) that the part of the human body which was figuratively connected with the Genius was not the sexual organ,³ as the theory in fashion claims, but the forehead: *frontem Genio (consecratam esse), unde uenerantes deum tangimus frontem* (Serv. *Aen.* 3.607). Finally, the festival of the Genius contains no sexual element. It is merely, for each person, the anniversary of his birth, his *dies natalis* (Censor. 2.3).

As for the *lectus genialis*, Otto's discussion (col. 1160, lines 23–43) is less satisfying. This expression does not prove what some have made it say. There are three texts which offer an explanation of it. (1) Servius (*Aen.* 6.603): “(The beds) are properly *geniales* which are prepared for young married people; they are so called from the bringing to the world of children, *a generandis liberis*.” (2) Paulus (p. 214 L²): “the *genialis lectus* is the one which is prepared during the nuptials in honor of the Genius, from whom it derives its name.” (3) Arnobius (*Gent.* 2.67): “When you marry, you make little beds with a toga and you invoke the *Genii* of your husbands.” The explanation by Servius does not mention the Genius, and seems to refer directly to the idea of fertility which appears in the root *gen-* and which, in Pliny for example, makes *genialis* a synonym of *fecundus* (*in tantum abundante geniali copia pecudum*, *N.H.* 17.53; etc.). This is certainly not the ancient meaning of *genialis*, and it is probable that the two other texts which cause Genius to intervene are based on authentic rites *in honorem Genii*; *maritorum Genios aduocatis*). But what do they prove? At the moment when the material condition is established, the

3. A connection between the *genius* and the phallus has been asserted (Altheim, Grenier), but this is an unsubstantiated assertion.

framework and the support of the coming births (and thus of the future Genii), is it not natural to evoke the birth of him who will be the agent of this propagation (and thus to honor and invoke his Genius)? Genius does not figure here as a god of procreation, a role moreover which he does not play elsewhere. He appears, as always, as the deified "personality" of the individual as he comes into the world, proceeding from a long line of other men, each with his own Genius, and summoned to bring into the world, through his offspring, another line, each member of which will likewise have his Genius. It is not from the sexual point of view but from that of the *gens* that we are to understand the consecration of the nuptial bed to the Genius of the actual representative of the series, and the homage paid to this Genius by the woman who has been chosen to continue the series.⁴ Something of this appears in the poem which Tibullus (1.7) dedicates to Messala on his birthday, that is, for the feast of his Genius. After evoking the military exploits of the triumphator, he invites the Nile, or Osiris, to share the joys of this day (lines 49-56):

... Come hither, celebrate with us his Genius in games and in dances, make the temples dizzy by streams of wine! Let perfumes drip from the shining locks of the god, let his head and neck be adorned with pliant garlands! Yes, come, god of this day, that I may offer thee the homage of incense and bring to thee sweet cakes drenched in Attic honey!

As for you, Messala, may you see children growing up who will add to the exploits of their father and, already famous, surround him in his old age . . .

Does this vow prove that Messala's Genius has its proper function in helping him to beget children? Not at all. The poet merely hopes that worthy children may in their turn succeed their illustrious father (*tibi succrescat proles*). The newly married women who *maritorum genios aduocant* before assuming their roles as wives express the same hope.

If my Genius is thus, either all at the same time or separately according to the point of view, the personality which was formed at my birth, my double, exhibiting my characteristics and my tastes, and finally a being separate from me who protects me, it is natural for other people, in their relations with me, to honor him. In this

4. Cf. *primigenius*, which does not mean the first-born or eldest brother, but the absolute first of all the generations, "primordial."

way we can understand the custom, attested in the works of the comic writers, of the slave's swearing by the Genius of his master (Plaut. *Capt.* 977; etc.), and the frequency of votive inscriptions raised by slaves to the Genius of the master—which would be peculiar if the Genius had a sexual significance. The whole *familia* takes part in the worship of the Genius: *eum decet omnis uos concelebrare*, says a *paterfamilias* on his birthday (*Pseud.* 165), but it is an ordered participation, in which the principal activities are left to the person chiefly concerned (*Censor.* 2.3).

In the classical authors and in the paintings at Pompeii, the Genius is frequently represented as a serpent, and in this form he often shows up in the conjugal bed (Cic. *Div.* 1.36; Jul. *Obs.* 58), although the serpent-father of the first Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus is more probably Jupiter (Gell. 6.1.3). But Greek coloration is apparent here.

A conception like this invited elaborations. They occurred in two senses: by assimilation to other representations, and by extension into gradually larger spheres. Before taking over the representation of the δαίμων, δαίμων αγαθός, the Genius was associated with the Lares, and was sometimes even confused with the most familiar member of their group. A number of inscriptions associate *Lares et Genium*, *Genio et Laribus*. At the furthest limit of this association, Censorinus (3.1) reports the opinion of "many ancient authors," and notably of Granius Flaccus, in the book *De indigitamentis* which was dedicated to Caesar and which would be so precious to us: *eundem esse Genium et Larem*.

A natural process of analogy, occurring in an era which cannot be identified, led to the attribution of a Genius to the gods themselves. Are they not "persons" like men, and though they do not suffer death, do they not, in the Hellenized mythology, undergo birth? The earliest example of this is not very old, dating only from 58 B.C., but the usage is certainly earlier than this. At the end of the *leges* of the temple of Jupiter Liber at Furfo (*CIL*, IX, 3513), we read *sei qui ad huc templum rem deiuin(a)m fecerit Joui Libero aut Jouis Genio, pelleis coria fanei sunt*. Under the Empire examples, both epigraphic and literary, are much more numerous, including the *Genius Priapi* of Petronius (chap. 21) and the *Genius Junonis* of Martianus Capella (1.53)—except sometimes only a Juno appears instead of the Genius. But the juridical spirit did not stop there. A protective Genius

was attributed to the "moral persons" constituted by families, the state, the provinces, the colleges, and military units: although the essential element of birth is not involved here, the Genius is no doubt an expression of the originality, of the distinctive personality, and occasionally of the *esprit de corps* of these various collective bodies. The most remarkable is that of the city of Rome itself, which was actually "born," and had its own *dies natalis*. As we have seen, the commentator on Virgil (*Aen.* 2.351) reports that there was a shield at the Capitol bearing the inscription: *Genio urbis Romae siue mas siue femina*.⁵ In 218, following a great number of frightening portents—and this was in the period between the battles of the Trebia and Lake Trasimene—five *hostiae maiores* were sacrificed to a Genius (*Liv.* 21.62.9),⁶ who can only be this *Genius urbis Romae*, or his equivalent, the *Genius populi Romani*. The latter Genius is subsequently involved many times, always on the occasion of prodigies (*Cass. Dio* 47.2.3; 50.8.2). At that time he had a temple in the Forum, near the temple of Concord, and several calendars of the imperial era (*CIL*, I², 214, 245) prescribe a sacrifice *Genio Publico, Faustae Felicitati, Veneri Victrici in Capitolio, Apollini in Palatino*. Associated in this way with great Beings, he enjoyed considerable popularity, along with the Genius of the prince.

Still further removed from the strict definition, but facilitated by the assimilation of the Genius to the Lar, an idea developed that each place had its Genius, *nullus locus sine Genio* (*Serv. Aen.* 5.95). Once conceived, however, this idea proliferated to the point where the gates, the baths, the market places, and even the smallest *anguli* all produced their own Genii. On the other hand, despite another generous definition by the same author (*Georg.* 1.302: *genium dicebant antiqui naturalem deum uniuscuiusque loci uel rei uel hominis*), it does not seem that *res*, in the sense of material objects, were similarly endowed with personalities.

Although, in its limited significance, the Genius of men was a familiar idea, it was not an important one until the intervention of the philosophers and the Hellenizers. The Lares and the Penates held a larger place in the imagination of the Romans, and in their relations with the gods this middle entity, which might have been an inter-

5. Above, pp. 39 and 43-44.

6. Below, pp. 460-61.

mediary, played no role. Not one general invokes his Genius on the field of battle, not one magistrate, not one orator during the political storms. Every transaction is made directly between men and the gods, *uos ego obsecro*. Sacred science did not overrefine this *ego*, the constant partner of the gods, body and soul, blood and will, breath and thought; or, if it had been analyzed in early speculations, which is hardly probable, they would have been covered over and transfigured by the bright phantasms coming from Greece, and Roman religion retained no trace of them.

This reserve in the exploration of the human being, this resistance to the attractions of words, is characteristic of the Romans, but it is no less so of the Vedic Indians, who are, however, capable of profound reveries. While their Iranian brothers, in the light of dualism, identify in each man his *fravaši*, his *daēnā*, etc., the poets and ritualists of the *ṚgVeda*, so ready to explore the details of the divine world, pay no heed to the invisible structure of man. In their religious language as in that of Rome, the vocabulary of the soul is short and without great scope. It is man in his entirety who implores Varuṇa or who praises Indra.⁷ We must thus guard against ascribing the poverty of this chapter of Roman theology to some basic inability of the Romans to analyze or to imagine. Rather, in the heart of Latium as well as on the threshold of India, the conquerors were totally oriented toward the world, and they externalized themselves entirely in those ambitions and activities for which the discipline of the soul was more important than the knowledge of it, and the practice of *magnanimitas* more important than the exploration of the *animus*.

THE DEAD

What remains of man after death? What we can glimpse of Roman beliefs before the coming of Etruscan and Greek influences is rough and confused—but we must not forget that even here Vedic India, despite the wealth of its imagination, is not better endowed. For these Arya brimming over with life, and for these Latin soldier-workers attached to the labor which passes from father to son, the beyond is without charm. Even in the self-sacrifice of heroes, it is “this world”

7. The speculations on *ātman*, etc., are later.

which counts, and their glory which will survive through the memory of men. For the rest, they are satisfied with summary representations. The relations between the dead and the living are without intimacy, without trust—all the more since the dead man, no matter how beloved or how admired he was, is regarded primarily as the source of the worst of pollutions. The double meaning of a word like *funestus* is proof of this. The *familia funesta* is not merely grief-stricken and unhappy, but soiled, contaminated, and contagious, until it shall have retrieved its condition of *familia pura*. Several sacred functions require their titular to be *patrimus* and *matrimus*, ἀμφιθαλής, to have both his father and his mother living. The dead are essentially outside of man's present concern; as Latte says (p. 100),

... in general, they do not intervene in the life of men; whatever formidable influence the *mos maiorum* may have had at Rome, it concerns only the memory of the actions of the living, not the activity of the dead. The famous oath of Demosthenes by the warriors of Marathon would not be possible at Rome. To be sure, the Romans believed in the power of the dead to avenge any negligence or violation of the ordering of the family, but in their daily needs they did not pray either to the *Diui Parentes* or to the *Manes*. There are no portrayals of a kingdom of the dead, of a beyond where they abide, nor of a head of such a kingdom. All that develops only under Greek influence, and partially under Etruscan influence. The impressive ceremony of the *pompa funebris*, in which the dead of the *gens* appear with the insignia of their functions, does not involve a cult of the dead, but is intended to render the glory of the family perceptible to the eyes, in this world. These various facts do not suggest that ancestor-worship played a fundamental role at Rome.

When Cicero writes, in the second book of his *De legibus*, 45, *Nunc ... de Manium iure restat*, what follows shows that he is thinking only of the February rites and of the meticulous prescriptions which govern burial.⁸

Even the vocabulary in this field is uncertain. The most usual expression in the texts which we read, *di-(u)i Manes*, or simply *Manes*, is surely ancient, although it is avoided by both Plautus and Terence.

8. In her letter to her son (probably authentic; H. Bardon, *La littérature latine inconnue* I (1952): 88), Cornelia exhorts him to respect the wishes of his mother, whom he will honor as a divinity when she is dead and to whom he will sacrifice. It is doubtful that this is a properly Roman belief. On the representations of the dead, see F. Cumont, *Lux perpetua* (1949).

Lucretius (3.52; 6.760: both times *d.M.*) and Cicero use it in a way which suggests that it is traditional.⁹ But it is used concurrently with another, rather strange expression, *diui parentum* (Fest. p. 338 L², in a *lex regia*), later corrected to *diui parentes*. *Mānes* was interpreted by the greater number of Roman scholars as a euphemism meaning "the Good gods" (cf. *manus* "good," with its etymological opposite, *immanis*), and in fact this is the most likely origin.¹⁰ As for the genitive *parentum* in *diui parentum*, it suggests that in primitive times the whole weight of the concept fell upon *diui*: not "heavenly," but "gods," and there is no possibility of determining the relation which was felt to exist between these "gods" and the *parentes*, or ancestors, whose gods they were.

These two denominations share one striking trait: they are plurals, designating collectively the great throng of the dead—a concept which recalls that of the *Pitṛaḥ* in the *R̥gVeda*, which are likewise not divided into singulars. Even when, through a shift in meaning, *di Manes* is used to designate the soul of a particular deceased person, paradoxically the plural is still used (which is proof, let it be said in passing, of the antiquity of the expression). One refers to the (*diui*) *Manes alicuius*, and we ourselves still speak, in French, of "les mânes d'Un Tel" on solemn occasions. If there is a shade of meaning, it is possible to think that in *diui parentum* the "ancestral" aspect was more heavily stressed, while the *Manes* were regarded as a distinct class of beings. This would explain why *diui Manes* sometimes seems to designate, beyond the dead, the whole vague population of the other world.¹¹

At some period which cannot be identified, one of the Greek conceptions of the *δαίμονες* seems to have reoriented the Roman idea of the *Manes*. With the expression in the *Aeneid* (6.743), *quisque suos patimur Manes* "each of us undergoes his *Manes*," Pierre Boyancé has associated the last words of the *Laudatio Turiae*, the funeral speech made by a bereaved husband to his wife, which dates from shortly after Virgil: *te di Manes tui ut quietam patiantur atque ita tueantur opto*, "I pray that your *di Manes* will allow you to be at rest and that they

9. It occurs in the formula of *deuotio*, above, p. 93.

10. The explanation of *Manes* as related to Phrygian *Μῆν* (Latte, p. 99, n. 3) is unlikely.

11. Bibliography on the *Manes* in Latte, p. 100, n. 2; the best study is F. Bömer, *Ahnenkult und Ahnenglaube im alten Rom*, ARW, 1943, supplement 1.

will protect you."¹² In at least these two cases, and probably in others, the *di Manes* are distinguished from the soul. They are protecting, and occasionally avenging "demons," comparable to the two personal demons occurring in certain Greek speculations which Servius, in connection with Virgil's line, has justly evoked: "When we are born, we receive two spirits, one of whom exhorts us to good and the other of whom leads us into evil." But of course this is not a properly Roman idea.

The only times of the year in which the living were specially concerned with the dead were the Parentalia in February and the Lemuria in May.

The former lasted from 13 to 21 February, and were *dies parentales* or *ferales* (Ov. *F.* 2.548 and 34). During this period, the magistrates stopped wearing their insignia, the temples were closed, fires did not burn on the altars, and marriages were not contracted (Ov. *F.* 2.533-70; Lyd. *Mens.* 4.29). Only the final day, which the calendars call *Feralia*, was a public festival, the first eight days being reserved for private rites, even though the calendar of Philocalus, on 13 February, notes that *Virgo Vesta[lis] parentat* (CIL, I² 309). The word *parentare*, which seems to mean "to make *parentes*, to treat as *parentes*," implies that each family is concerned at this time with its own dead: Ovid, to whom we owe almost all our information concerning the festival (*F.* 2.527-64), glosses *animas placate paternas*. To the tombs themselves are brought garlands and a very simple feast, consisting of salt, some bread softened in pure wine, and a few violets. During these nine days the dead rise again, wander hither and thither, and feed on the victuals which are served to them (*F.* 2. 565-66). They do not seem to take advantage of this short holiday in the open air to disturb the living or to haunt houses. It is not easy to see what distinguishes the *Feralia*, in the private cult, from the preceding days, since Varro defines them *ferunt tum epulas ad sepulcrum quibus ius ibi parentare* (L.L. 6.13), except perhaps (Fest. p. 202 L²) for the sacrifice of a sheep. However, in both Varro and Festus, the distinction seems only to proceed from false etymologies (*a ferendis epulis*, *a feriendis*

12. "Les deux démons personnels dans l'antiquité grecque et latine," *RPh.* 61 (1935): 189-202. The author has subsequently modified his interpretation somewhat; see his "Sur le discours d'Anchise (*Enéide*, VI, 724-751)," *Coll. Lat.* 45 (*Hommages à G. Dumézil*) (1960): 60-76 (esp. pp. 69-72), and *La religion de Virgile* (1963), pp. 170-74.

pecudibus). As for the public rites, nothing of them survives. On this day, moreover, an old woman, surrounded by young girls, sacrifices to a Tacita who is, according to Ovid (615), the *Mater Larum* (perhaps through a play of words on *laruae*), but whom the pleasant little story which he tells does not explain. On 22 February, the day following the Feralia, the members of each family gathered for a banquet, and this gathering was called *Caristia* (*Calendar of Philocalus*, Ov. F. 2.617, etc.), for which there survives elsewhere the variant *cara cognatio* (Tert. *Idol.* 10.3).

The rites of the Lemuria, on 9, 11, and 13 May, are based on another aspect of the dead. As in the Feralia, offerings are placed on the tombs (Ov. F. 5.425-26). Under the name of *lemures*, the ancestors emerged from their graves and, bolder than in February, returned to visit the houses in which they had lived. It was necessary to confront these unwished-for guests with actions and words calculated to appease and dispel them. According to Ovid (5.429-44),

When midnight has come and lends silence to sleep, and dogs and all the varied fowls are hushed, the worshipper who bears the olden rite in mind and fears the gods arises; no knots constrict his feet; and he makes a sign with his thumb in the middle of his closed fingers, lest in his silence an unsubstantial shade should meet him. And after washing his hands clean in spring water, he turns, and first he receives black beans and throws them away with face averted; but while he throws them, he says: "These I cast; with these beans I redeem me and mine." This he says nine times, without looking back: the shade is thought to gather the beans, and to follow unseen behind. Again he touches water, and clashes Temesan bronze, and asks the shade to go out of his house. When he has said nine times, "Ghosts of my fathers, go forth!" he looks back, and thinks that he has duly performed the sacred rites.

From this text it appears that the ghost, if it were not gently lured toward the door by the beans to which it was partial, would carry away some living person along with him into the realm of death. The exact quality of the regulations inspires our confidence, but the formulas have evidently been touched up in order to fit the meter, and we cannot be sure that in the final exhortation the spirits were actually called *Manes paterni*.¹³

These *lemures* of May are not the same as the *laruae*; the latter

13. There is no reason for proclaiming "a blunder of Ovid," as H. J. Rose does, with the approval of Latte, p. 99, n. 2.

come at any time of the year, not to visit but to torment the living, and Plautus's characters speak of them without sympathy. They even enter into men, where their presence causes troublesome mental symptoms. The doctor of the *Menaechmi* can ask: *Quid esse illi morbi dixerat? narra senex, num laruatust aut cerritus? fac sciam num eum ueternus aut aqua intercus tenet?* (889-91). *Laruat* thus vies with lethargy and hydropsy in the doctor's diagnosis, and at first with raging madness; "the man possessed by *laruae*" exhibits the same symptoms as "the man possessed by Ceres" (*cerritus*, cf. Δημητρόληπτος) or "the man possessed by nymphs" (*lymphatus*, cf. νυμφόληπτος). All of this means simply that we must not try to circumscribe the idea and that nightmares, evil spirits, etc., were mingled with the unknown dead in a state of complete anarchy.

The connection between the Manes of the dead man and the Genius of the living man was made, but at a late date. There is nothing to suggest that in primitive times the Genii were transformed into *diui parentum*. Emptied of his substance, evanescent, the dead man is still a complete being, but an anonymous being, lost in the immense crowd of his fellows. One would like to be able to deduce from the various kinds of funeral ceremony a succession, by evolution or variation, in the attitudes toward the life *post mortem*, and this undertaking has been attempted more than once. But we must be very prudent in these matters. As is recalled in my "Preliminary Remarks," there are numerous examples to prove that cremation and inhumation may occur side by side in a single society, or that one may supplant the other without involving any divergence in beliefs. If then at Rome, in the dawn of history, or even in prehistoric times, we observe the transition from one method to another of disposing of the dead, we must not automatically infer from this transition either ethnic innovations or ideological changes. Pliny (*N.H.* 7.187) gives an indication that entirely different reasons may be involved: "The burning of bodies is not an institution of the greatest antiquity at Rome. Originally they were buried. The custom of burning them was established when the Romans realized, during their distant wars, that tombs were not always sacred refuges. Nevertheless several families preserved the ancient custom. The dictator Sulla was the first of the Cornelii to be burned. He himself had given the order for

this because, having disinterred Marius's corpse, he feared retaliation." This decision by Sulla obviously does not imply his conversion to other views regarding the afterlife.

Nor can we seek any illumination from the idea of Orcus,¹⁴ which is itself obscure. Plautus, like Cicero, knows Orcus only as a divine person to whose abode one goes (*Asin.* 606), who knows if someone is alive or dead (*Capt.* 283), who accepts or rejects candidates for his empire (*Pseud.* 795), etc. Probably this does not represent the most ancient attitudes. Plautus is obviously assimilating Orcus to Pluto, as the ruler over "the Acheruns," which he makes the kingdom of the dead. But there is nothing which allows us to form a definite opinion. Orcus is ignored in both public and private cult. Festus's note (Paul. p. 363 L²), *Quietalis ab antiquis dicebatur Orcus*, tells us nothing that we might not expect a priori from such a representation.

14. The association with Greek *δρκος* is only a play on words. On Orcus, among the most recent studies, see H. Wagenvoort, "Orcus," *SMSR* 14 (1938): 32-64, reprinted in *Studies in Roman Literature, Culture, and Religion* (1956), pp. 102-31; J. Heurgon, "Le lemme de Festus sur Orcus (p. 222 L)," *Coll. Lat.* 23 (*Hommages à M. Niedermann*) (1956): 168-73 (Etruscan derivation).

5

FORCES AND ELEMENTS

THIRD FUNCTION

A number of divinities are concerned with the products of the earth and particularly with the cereal grains, either as they approach maturity or when they are already in the service of man: Robigus, the personification of wheat rust, who spares the grains at the prayer of the flamen of Quirinus; Flora, who causes the plants to blossom; Consus, who protects the stored grains; Ops, who guarantees the abundance of the harvests; and Quirinus himself, whose festival ends the time when the grains are roasted. But a goddess who is more profound, whose activity is more extensive and more continuous, is Ceres, Growth, along with her intimate associate, Tellus, Earth,¹ whose collaboration has been characterized by Ovid (F. 1.671-74): "Propitiate the mothers of cultivation, Tellus and Ceres, with their own spelt and with the entrails of a pregnant sow. Ceres and Earth guarantee the same function: one provides the tillages with their origin and the other with their place."

With the reservation that both are active, *causa* and *locus* are good definitions of these two Entities, one of whom transforms and restores that which has been entrusted to the other, one of whom reveals that which the other has concealed. United or separated in the cult

1. In addition to the important articles on Tellus in *DA* (J. A. Hild) and *RL* (Wissowa), on Terra Mater in *RE* (S. Weinstock), and the very personal book by F. Altheim, *Terra Mater*, *RVV* 22, 2 (1931) (pp. 108-29, "Ceres und Tellus"), see especially J. Bayet, "Les *feriae sementinae* et les indigitions dans le culte de Cérès et de Tellus," *RHR* 137 (1950): 172-206, and H. Le Bonniec, *Le culte de Cérès à Rome des origines à la fin de la République* (1958) (with the review by P. Boyancé, *REA* 61 [1959]: 111-20). The sometimes surprising amount of attention paid to the Earth-Mother ever since A. Dieterich's *Mutter Erde* (1905) is well known. For all the agricultural festivals at Rome, see A. J. Festugière, *L'enfant d'Agrigente* (1941), pp. 56-87.

according to the seasons, both of them are truly *matres frugum*. Liber, a rather more obscure masculine agent, collaborates with them. None of these divinities was included by the annalistic tradition in the list of the "gods of Titus Tatius." They regulate fertility in a different manner from those who are named in that list.

There is no attested formula which pairs Sky and Earth, as is done among a number of peoples, particularly in Greece and in Vedic India. At the beginning of his treatise on rural economy, when Varro invokes *Juppiter pater* and *Tellus mater*, qualifying them as *parentes magni*, he is speaking as a philosopher nurtured on Greek literature, and he is not referring to any liturgical practice at Rome. To be sure, water from the sky is necessary for Ceres's activities, but the marriage, which is so well known among other peoples, is not expressly indicated in Roman cult.

Although the temple of Tellus on the Esquiline dates from only 268, there are reasons for believing that the site had been consecrated to her for more than two centuries at least.² In any case, the principal festival is very ancient.³ On 15 April, two days after the Ides, there took place a veritable sacred slaughter. In the buildings of the thirty curiae, on the Capitol, and also privately, in the fields, there was the sacrifice *forda boue*, of a cow in calf, in the ceremony called *Fordicidia*. From the fact that the festival is not named after the goddess but after the act, it has sometimes been concluded that the goddess was not involved in it in primitive times and that the rite was originally based on pure magic, directly coercing nature without the intermediacy of a divine person. This is an intellectual view, which is contradicted by the descriptions. In all instances it is a question of sacrifices whose beneficiary is Tellus (Ov. *F.* 4.634: *Telluri . . . uictima plena datur*; 665: *Tellus placanda*) or, in Greek, "Demeter" (Lyd. *Mens.* 4.72).

The principle of this sacrifice is clear. As Ovid says, it takes place at the moment when everything is gravid, the earth with its sowings, as well as the beasts. This is why a pregnant victim is offered to the pregnant Tellus, both by virtue of the ordinary symbolic rule that a divinity is offered victims which are homologous to it (male or female,

2. Weinstock, in *RE*, col. 804.

3. What follows sums up the first essay in Dumézil, *RIER* ("Fordicidia"), pp. 11-25, where references to the Indian ritual texts will be found.

according to its sex; white, red, or black, according to the domain or the effect of its action); and also in order to provide this divinity, in a different form, with what it is supposed to produce. The establishment of the rites was attributed to Numa. One year all vegetable and animal fertility seemed to be corrupted; from the first shoots, Ceres deceived the farmer, the cows aborted, the ewes died while lambing . . . Numa consults Faunus, the giver of oracles and the expert, if not the trustee, of the secrets of life. The god answers him enigmatically: "O King, thou must appease Earth by the death of two cows: let one heifer yield two lives in sacrifice." Egeria provides the solution to the riddle: "What is demanded of thee," she tells the king, "are the inwards of a pregnant cow." Numa obeys the order; "the year proved more fruitful, and earth and cattle yielded their increase" (Ov. *F.* 4.641-72).

Sacrifice of cows in calf are rare elsewhere in the world. Recently Mme Marie-José Tubiana gave a fine description and analysis of several such sacrifices in a group of African societies,⁴ but the most useful parallel is furnished by the Vedic Indians, who use another enigmatic expression, *aṣṭāpādī* "the cow with eight feet," to designate the victim. The Roman and the Indian rites have a parallel development, and once again the commentaries of the brahmins provide a simultaneous explanation of the Roman and the Indian ritual.

The latter, annexed to the ceremony of royal consecration,⁵ directs the offering of two cows in calf to Earth and to the Marut, who are treated on this occasion as "the peasantry [*viśaḥ*] of the gods." But such an offering raised an embarrassing problem for the liturgists. Although on the one hand it seems to be praiseworthy for its abundance, involving two lives in one body, on the other hand it is incorrect, since the embryo is an imperfect animal (*avikṛtāṅgaḥ* "with undifferentiated parts"), and is unsuitable for sacrifice. Thus they had to find a means of associating the embryo with the sacrifice, but without sacrificing it. The solution they hit upon is as follows.

4. "Un rite de vie, le sacrifice d'une bête pleine chez les Zaghawa Kobé du Ouaddaï," *Journal de psychologie*, 1960, pp. 291-310; but, according to the descriptions given by the author herself, and in contradiction of her interpretation, the use made of the embryo (not sacrificed; treated secondarily) seems to be the same as in India and Rome.

5. An exceptional variant is anticipated when, in the sacrifice of a cow which must be sterile, it is discovered that the victim is pregnant. It is immediately withdrawn from its recipients (Mitra and Varuṇa) and offered to the Marut, who are still regarded as the "commoners" of the gods.

Once the cow has been killed, one of the sacrificing priests pulls the embryo out of the belly, and without cutting off any of its parts, merely extracts from its neck some "fatty juice," which will represent it in the offering. The cow is then treated like any ordinary victim. The sacrificial pieces are set aside and cooked over the fire, along with the "fatty juice" of the embryo, and are finally offered to Earth. As for the embryo itself, it remains available for another beneficent operation, but one which is not sacrificial: facing eastward, without words of consecration, it is offered to the Marut and then covered with charcoal, while the priest recites⁶ a strophe of a hymn requesting Sky and Earth "to season this sacrifice and to fill us with sustaining things." Thus everything is arranged for the best: there is a fictitiously double sacrifice, yet without the flaw which the immolation of an incomplete creature would involve; on the other hand, the embryo has not been wasted, but has been used in a supplementary rite.

Lacking liturgical books at Rome, we yet have Ovid's precise and technical summing up of the ceremony, which gives proof that the Romans had solved the same problem in a very similar fashion. Indeed, for them too the embryo was not a possible victim, since the animal destined for sacrifice had to be certified as *purum*, whole and without blemish at the *probatio* before it was accepted. This would rule out, even as *lactentia*, those animals which were too young, and with much greater reason, the embryos. Here, then, is what happens (F. 4.637-40):

... When the attendants have torn the calves from the bowels of their dams, and placed the cut entrails on the smoking hearths, the eldest (Vestal) Virgin burns the calves in the fire, that their ashes may purify the people on the day of Pales.

Thus, just as in India, the liturgical destinies of the mother and of her offspring are different. The cow is killed along with her embryo, but soon afterward the latter is extracted, and it is only then that the *exta* of the cow, the *pura* victim, are set aside and transmitted to the gods. The embryo itself is saved for another use, which is not a sacrifice and which we shall shortly meet again. This is the same scheme as the sacrifice of the *aṣṭāpadī*.

Such is the principal circumstance in which Tellus is served alone.

6. In the exceptional variant.

It is not known if Varro's statement should be connected with it, in which he says that "the pontiffs sacrifice to Tellus" and to some of her masculine *indigitationes*, Tellumo, Altor, and Rusor.⁷ In any case, to judge from Ovid's opinion as it emerges in the etiological account, the wished-for gestation is primarily that of the cereal grains, but the female animals also derive some benefit from it. The function of Tellus preserves the general character which is usual among "Earth-Mothers."

Ceres presents other problems. Unfortunately for whoever seeks to know the oldest Roman religion, she had the luck of receiving an *interpretatio graeca* which was both early and full of future prospects.⁸ Perhaps at the close of the regal era, she became Demeter and gradually appropriated the rich domain, the dramatic legend, the very rites, almost the mysteries of that great goddess. The assimilation seems also to have taken place independently in Oscan territory. One of the principal surviving inscriptions in that language enumerates, on bronze, the "stations" "which are *húrtin Kerriün*, in the garden (probably the sacred wood) of Ceres," near Agnone. Among the first divinities whose stations are thus listed, Ceres and "the daughter of Ceres" are named one after the other: evidently this means Demeter and Persephone.⁹ Another inscription, on lead, is a formula of malediction which thrice vows and delivers the persons being cursed *Keri Arentikai*, that is, probably to an Avenging Ceres, in other words, to an infernal Demeter.¹⁰

Her name, which follows an exceptional declension (-ēs, -eris), is derived from the same root as the inchoative *cresco* and the causative *creare*. It is doubtless an abstraction, "Growth" personified. This root **ker-* apparently covers the same semantic field as the Indo-Iranian *sū-*, the old Indo-European root which provided the common

7. There is no Tellumo-Tellus pair of the *Liber-Libera* type, nor any doubt regarding the sex of the divinity. Except for polemic purposes, if one happens to be Saint Augustine, Tellumo must not be extracted from the series in which he appears (*Ciu. D.* 7.23.2 to the end), and which is to Tellus what the series *Veruactor*, etc., is to Ceres, above, p. 35 and p. 43, n. 10. Nor is there any reason for giving Tellumo an Etruscan origin. Tellurus, in Martianus Capella 1.49, is almost certainly an archaic variant of the genitive *Telluris*.

8. S. Sabbatucci, "Di alcuni sacrifici romani alla luce del mito di Korè," *SMSR* 28 (1957): 53-66.

9. Ritual of the table of Agnone, Vetter, no. 147.

10. Vetter, no. 6.

tongue with the words for "son" (**sūnu-*, *uíos*, etc.) and probably for that very prolific animal, the pig (Latin *sūs*, etc.). Vedic *sūte* means "he, or she gives birth to, produces," and conjugated *suṽāti*, "he provides the impulse"; whence the radical substantive *sū-* "he, or she who gives birth" on the one hand, and on the other hand, the name of the god *Savitár* "the Impeller," who is the most active of the "gods of the beginnings" in the mythology and in the rituals. In Latin, the equivalent root **ker-* has produced on the one hand the name of the goddess *Ceres* (whose typical victim is the sow), and on the other hand the archaic designation of the "god of the beginnings," *cerus manus*, which the scholars of antiquity still knew enough to translate as "creator bonus" (Paul. p. 249 L²) and which seems to have been used to qualify Janus. The Indian parallel shows that there is no reason to consider *cerus* as a "masculine Ceres," as is often done. Janus, who is a "creator" because he is an "initiator," has no connection with *Ceres*, who bears in herself the motive of growth.¹¹

Beyond this archaic name, the existence of a *flamen Cerialis* guarantees the antiquity and the importance of the goddess. But to what extent was she transformed by *Demeter*? Opinions differ. Certain radical critics assert that everything we know is so contaminated by the Greek that any sorting out is impossible. Others have undertaken this task patiently and prudently, and one may profitably follow the most recent exegete of this complicated question, Henri Le Bonniec.

The *Cerialia* of 19 April—which later became the end of a period beginning on 12 April—follow by four days the *Fordicidia* of the fifteenth. Such an interval always proclaims a relationship between the festivals which it separates, and thus here connects *Tellus* and *Ceres*, while still respecting their difference. There is a close symbolic correspondence of the two rituals to their respective roles. Cows in calf were immolated to the "pregnant" Earth; of the *Cerialia*, except for the sacrifice of the animal appropriate to the goddess, the fertile sow (at least in the private cult, Ov. *F.* 4.413, on 12 April), only one rite is known. It concerns, in advance, the grown crops. The *ludi* of 19 April included a barbaric, magical, and nonsacrificial scene. In the *Circus* (Ov. *F.* 4. 679–82) foxes were let loose "with torches tied to their burning backs." The significance of this letting loose, these

11. On *Çerfus*, see above, pp. 244–45.

foxes, and this fire has been much discussed, but whether they are understood as lustrational or fecundating, they can only concern the ears of grain in formation, after their emergence from the earth. Later, in the Ambarvalia of May, why should Ceres have been absent? What has been preserved of the song of the Fratres Arvales does not speak of her; along with Mars, the warlike protector of the fields, it mentions only the Semones, the spirits of the sowings, and the Lares, the spirits of the place. However, several descriptions of the festival (triple circumambulation, and lustration either of the *pagus* or of an estate) make room for the goddess of growth (Tib. 2.1; Verg. *Georg.* 1.338-50). Finally, before the harvest, a *porca praecidaneae* was sacrificed to her in a ritual whose details were noted by Cato (*Agr.* 134). This is what can be attributed with great probability to the most ancient Ceres, as her exclusive property. It will be noted that her dissociation from Tellus starts with the April festivals: the first goddess somehow then gives way before the second.

By contrast, the *feriae sementinae*, a double festival which was movable within the limits of the second half of January, place the two goddesses in association (*Ov. F.* 1.657-96), as is natural at this point in the career of the grain, when all its mysteries are once more performed in the earth.¹² And it is possible that a common festival joined them together as early as 13 December, at the end of the sowing time, but it is attested only at a time when it assumed the foreign form of the *lectisternium* (*CIL*, 1², 336-37, fragment of the *Praeneste calendar*).

Fertility has other spheres of activity besides the fields and agricultural labors. The Earth Mother is not confined to these two areas at Rome any more than she is in Greece or India, and the "Growth" goddess cannot fail to take an interest in the human race. *Quidam*, says Servius II (*Aen.* 4.166), *Tellurem praeesse nuptiis tradunt*; and as proof of this he offers the fact that young brides, while going to the houses of their husbands or after their arrival, sacrifice to her *uariis nominibus uel ritu*. Here Tellus regained her regular companion, since, as Festus says (p. 204 L²), *facem in nuptiis in honorem Cereris praeferebant*. And the link between Ceres and marriage was maintained after the nuptial rites. According to Plutarch (*Rom.* 22.5), the "law of Romulus" which limits to three the causes for which a husband may legitimately

12. L. Delatte, *Recherches sur quelques fêtes mobiles du calendrier romain* (1937), pp. 3-13.

repudiate his wife (poisoning of children, counterfeiting of his keys, and adultery), orders that if he puts her away for other reasons, "half his substance shall belong to the wife, and the other half shall be consecrate to Ceres."

Last of all, the Earth, the storehouse of fertility and of the future, also conceals in its lower levels the gloomy domain to which the dead have access through their tombs and with which the state maintains a controlled communication by means of the *mundus*. There is a constant and mysterious connection between that which dies and that which is born, between the evanescent shades and life in gestation. Although it cannot be said that the two goddesses are "goddesses of death," they take part in two circumstances of the funeral rites. After every death, it seems, a sow was offered to Ceres in order to purify the family. As this sacrifice was partly performed "with the body present," the sow was called *praesentanea* (Fest. p. 357 L²); on the other hand (Varr. in Non. p. 240 L), if a dead person was not buried (*humatus*), the family could become pure again only by offering to Tellus and Ceres a sow which was this time called *praecidanea*, the same name as that of the sow which precedes the harvest, and with which it has sometimes been confounded. Finally it will be remembered that the *mundus* belonged to Ceres, and that it was probably within the walls of that goddess's temple.

Thus we catch a glimpse of two important deities of the earliest religion, related and irreducible, between whom there is no reason for supposing a chronological sequence.

Another pair of divinities of the same group, who did not have Ceres's luck, or rather who barely survived together because of their association with Ceres, is Liber-Libera.¹³ The Liberalia are celebrated on 17 March. From Varro (*L.L.* 6.14) and Ovid (*F.* 3.713-90), we know some of the rites of this festival, which is apparently ancient. Old women crowned with ivy, who were generously called *sacerdotes Liberi*, sold honey cakes in the street. They had with them little portable hearths on which a part of the cake was offered to Liber in

13. In addition to the articles *Liber (pater)*, *Libera*, in *DA* (J. Toutain), *RL* (Wissowa), *RE* (Schur), and A. Schnegelsberg's old dissertation, *De Liberi apud Romanos cultu capita duo* (1895), we now have at our disposal A. Bruhl, *Liber Pater, origine et expression du culte dionysiaque à Rome et dans le monde romain* (1953) (first chapter, pp. 13-29, "Le problème du *Liber pater* italique").

the name of the buyer. Moreover, on this day young people put on man's clothing, the *toga uirilis* or *libera*. Saint Augustine, following Varro, but possibly a Varro whom he has somewhat touched up, adds the following: the Liber-Libera pair is said to preside over the male and female components of the generative process, or more precisely, over the "liberation"—which is nothing but a play on words—of these components, in the form of seed (*Ciu. D.* 7.3.1). In certain parts of Italy the cult is supposed to have assumed particularly shameless forms: for example, it was said that a phallus, borne in a wagon into the country, was brought back to the city in triumph; that at Lavinium a whole month was consecrated to it, during which everyone indulged in obscene words until the moment when the member, after being carried through the Forum, was restored to its resting place; that the most virtuous matrons had the duty of crowning it with wreaths in public, thus driving away the *fascinatio*, or enchantment, from the fields, and assuring a prosperous harvest (*Ciu. D.* 7.21); and that at Rome representations of the male and female organs were placed in their temple, one for Liber, the other for Libera. From this flow of details it appears at least that Liber and Libera had a rather general jurisdiction over fertility, and, as far as Liber is concerned, not merely over the growth of the grape, which caused him to be assimilated to Dionysos. But this specialization must be very ancient. Not far from Rome, at Falerii, a vase inscription which seems to date from the sixth century¹⁴ requests that Ceres provide spelt (*farme[n]tom*) and Loufir—that is, Liber—wine. Liber's name has been explained by E. Benveniste¹⁵ as based on an old derivative in *-es-* of the Italic and Indo-European stem **leudh-*. The proper meaning should be "he of the germination, he who guarantees birth and the harvest," which is, as Le Bonniec has observed, very close to the etymological meaning of Ceres.

These several facts, which seem to be clear, nevertheless form the foundation for one of the most complicated problems in the history of Roman religion. At the beginning of the republican period, when Ceres receives a temple on the lowest slopes of the Aventine, it is a

14. Vetter, no. 241, with bibliography; add M. Lejeune, "A propos de trois inscriptions italiques," *REA* 54 (1952): 340–42.

15. "Liber et liberi," *REL* 14 (1936): 52–58.

templum Cereris Liberi Liberaeque, a building with three *cellae*, whose foundation is traditionally associated with the first contests between the patriciate and the plebs. How are we to understand this grouping, which recalls certain Greek triads in which Demeter and her daughter Persephone are associated with a masculine type, who is sometimes, but only rarely, Dionysos? Did the elements of the triad have an earlier, separate existence at Rome and were they merely combined; or was the complete triad imported ready-made? and from where: Sicily? Campania? Is the plebeian tradition authentic, or was it merely added to give a flavor of antiquity to a state of affairs which was well known in the following centuries, the monopoly exercised by the plebeians and their magistrates over the cult of Ceres? What role was played by politics in the establishment of the cult? Le Bonniec has very clearly summed up and evaluated the great arguments which confront one another in numerous variants, and in his turn has proposed a hypothetical but reasonable solution, which assigns considerable importance to the properly Roman element and accords a no less generous credit to the annalistic tradition.¹⁶ From these drifting mists which have been so ably investigated, several islets of probability emerge.

The cult of the Aventine is not so much directed to the Ceres of the peasants, the technician of agriculture as we have observed her up to now, as to the Ceres of the *annona*, the overseer of provisions who protects the urban population from famines, which were numerous in this era. Possibly inspired by foreign models, the triad in which there is an association of Ceres with the Liber-Libera pair, rather than of the two goddesses with the god, is entirely indigenous in its structure. The establishment of the "triad of fertility" some years after the dedication of the temple of the Capitoline Jupiter, with its three *cellae*, indicates an intention to answer in kind, to counterbalance. Under these conditions, and since it is in fact at this point that the plebs obtained its first official magistrates, is it not natural to accept the chief lines of tradition, sacrificing only a few pretty legends and a few anachronistic proper names? The Aventine cult is evidence of a victory of the plebs, resulting from one of the first of the many compromises which little by little were to assure that social class of political and religious equality. The classic pattern—the plebeian

16. Chap. 9, "La triade Cérès-Liber-Libera," pp. 277-311.

aediles holding office in the outbuildings of the temple and accumulating there the archives of the plebs, the texts of the plebiscites, and later, as a precautionary measure, duplicates of the *senatus consulta* of the rival order¹⁷—would have been formed in the beginning of the fifth century, at the time of the foundation.

In any case, once the threefold cult had been created, Demeter continued to impose herself upon the Romans through their Ceres. Beginning with the regal era, the process of assimilation went through alternating slow periods and crises of acceleration.¹⁸ In the second half of the third century the cult was officially introduced, served by Greek priestesses who were qualified as *publicae*. In a summer festival, doubtless movable, the *sacrum anniuersarium Cereris*, the Roman matrons celebrated the reunion of a Ceres and a Proserpina, who were none other than Demeter and Persephone. Thus (at least this is the likeliest explanation) Rome had its own mysteries, the *initia Cereris* (Varr. *R.R.* 2.4.9; 3.1.5). As for Liber, he was gradually taken over by Dionysos-Bacchus, and once the crisis of the Bacchanalia was past, triumphed with the wine.

If the Fordicidia of 15 April and the Cerialia of 19 April occur in the close alliance which we are led to expect from the interdependence of the divinities to whom they are addressed, and which is proved by their juxtaposition and the four-day interval between them, another festival, involving a different kind of connection, is associated with the Fordicidia. This is the Parilia of 21 April. The ashes of the calves pulled out of the *boues fordae*, preserved by the Vestals for six days, form one of the ingredients of the *suffimen*, the purificatory fumigation which characterizes the feast of Pales, goddess of shepherds and flocks.¹⁹

17. Along with this hypothesis must be mentioned that of A. Alföldi, "Il santuario federale latino di Diana sull' Aventino e il tempio di Ceres," *SMSR* 32 (1961): 21–39, which brings the foundation of the temple and its political use to after the time of the decemvirs, in the second half of the fifth century (pp. 32–33). The execution which he performs (n. 39, "perperam omnino") on Le Bonniec, p. 357, needs some explanation: Le Bonniec's reply to the objection of S. Mazzarino is well founded. But it is only too plain that the true history of the first years of the Republic is not to be found in the annalistic tradition. Think, for instance, of the mythical figures of Coclès and Scaevola, above, p. 75. A. Alföldi has presented all his personal views on the relations between Rome and its neighbors in *Early Rome and the Latins* (1964), see below p. 446, n. 1.

18. J. Bayet, "Les Cerialia, altération d'un culte latin par le mythe grec," *RPh.* 29 (1951): 5–32, 341–66.

19. What follows sums up "Les deux Palès," *REL* 40 (1962): pp. 109–17; reprinted, with some modification, in *IR*, pt. III, chap. 3.

Goddess, and not god: there is no uncertainty concerning her sex. Three documents do indeed speak of a masculine Pales, but they do not concern Rome. Arnobius (3.40), following a specialist in Etruscan matters, says that Pales, not a goddess as at Rome, but a god, was one of the Etruscan Penates (cf. Serv. *Aen.* 2.325), and he defines him as a kind of *minister* and *uillicus* of Jupiter. In two passages (1.50 and 51), Martianus Capella locates a god Pales in the sixth and seventh regions of the sky, but the context proves that, here too, entirely Etruscan conceptions are involved. Thus all that these texts prove is that the divinity to whom the Etruscans entrusted animal husbandry, and who was consequently equivalent to Pales and was called Pales like his *interpretatio romana*, was a god and not a goddess. Given the prestige of the Etruscan disciplines, the Roman scholars doubtless thought that this conception was more ancient and more distinguished than the Roman one. This is why Arnobius writes: *Palem, non illam feminam, quam uulgaritas accipit, sed masculini generis*. But this was an affair for learned men, without consequence for the practice or the conceptions of the living religion. It is certainly this Etruscan Pales of the scholars whom Varro mentioned in a passage to which Virgil's commentator, Servius, unfortunately only alludes, without citing it (*Georg.* 3.1): *hanc Vergilius genere feminino appellat, alii, inter quos Varro, masculino genere, ut hic Pales*. In fact we have proof that this was not Varro's conception when he encountered Pales not as a scholar but as a literary author. It occurs in a fragment of the Menippean Satires cited by Aulus Gellius (13.23) which names in two lines a number of divinities, among whom is Pales and of whom all the others are female:

*Te Anna ac Perenna, Panda Cela, te Pales,
Nerienes <et> Minerua, Fortuna ac Ceres.*

Thus it is certain that Pales is a goddess at Rome, and it is an abuse of the foregoing texts to cite her as an illustration of the alleged difficulty experienced by the Romans in forming a clear and complete conception of their divinities.

Nonetheless Pales has a remarkable quality: she is twofold, or perhaps there are even two Pales. A fragment of the Antium calendar indicates a feast *Palibus II* on 7 July, while the *Parilia* take place on 21 April. Moreover, Jacques Heurgon recalled in 1951 that in a passage of Varro (*R.R.* 2.5.1), all the manuscripts give *Palibus*, which editors

of the past four centuries have wrongly emended in various ways.²⁰ Merely by replacing Varro's phrase in its context, we can see that it is located at the articulation of the two dissertations on animal husbandry: earlier, the interlocutors of the colloquy spoke of the smaller livestock, and afterwards of the larger. Just at this point a latecomer arrives, who does not know what stage has been reached in the order of the day; in an amusing interlude, Varro quite naturally ascribes to him the idea of making his excuses by paying a forfeit "to the Pales (plural)," which means certainly "to the two Pales," the goddess of the small and the goddess of the large cattle: *dum asses soluo Palibus*. This interpretation is confirmed by the plan of the third book of the *Georgics*, which is devoted to animal husbandry. It is divided into two strictly equal parts, one devoted to the large and the other to the small animals. At the beginning of each section the poet invokes Pales (1 and 289), whereas in the book devoted to the labors of the fields, Ceres is mentioned only once, at the beginning, as is Bacchus in the book which deals with gardens and the vineyard. This interpretation is based on the duality of the festivals, on 21 April and 7 July. Whereas we are given no specific information concerning the summer festival, Ovid's long description (*F.* 4.721-86) of the springtime Parilia concerns only the smaller livestock, and the treatises on rural economy allow us to understand why. These two dates were those on which the animals were mated. Concerning the sheep, Columella (7.3) writes: "The almost unanimous opinion is that the first season for having them covered is the spring, at the Parilia [*tempus uernum Parilibus*], at least for those which are ready; for those which have just lambed, wait until the month of July [*circa Julium mensem*]," but he recommends the earlier season, "since the autumn lamb is worth more than the spring lamb." By contrast, in the case of cows a single season is prescribed (6.2): they should be serviced *mense Julio*. Among other reasons, he says, it is the period of their rutting, *naturalia desideria, quoniam satietate uerni pabuli pecudes* [i.e., here *boues*] *exhilaratae lasciuunt in uenerem*. The rites follow these expediencies. In those of 21 April, when only sheep are involved, a single Pales is concerned; on the Nones of July, when other sheep, but especially the cows, are to be serviced, one addresses oneself *Palibus II*. As Ovid did not celebrate the July festivities in verse, we do not know what

20. "Au dossier de Palès," *Lat.* 10 (1951): 277-78.

was then requested of the two goddesses, but it must have been appreciably the same, adapted to the whole body of livestock, as what his April distichs demanded of one of them, for the *greges*.²¹

Thus there is no reason for denying to Pales the festival of the Parilia (from **Palilia*: cf. *caeruleus* from **caeluleus* "sky-colored, blue") and for making her, by an improbable etymology for which the moderns have fewer excuses than the ancients (Paul. p. 328 L²), a goddess of births (*parere*, and also *parire* in Cato and Plautus). The rites and prayers described by Ovid show clearly that the intention is not limited to the *partus*. What is demanded is the total and permanent protection of the herds and of animal-breeding. The ruttishness of the rams is of course requested, with its consequence, the increase of lambs, but also the health of the animals, the shepherds, and their dogs; the removal of wolves and of midday demons; the abundance of grass and water; good wool and milk products; and primarily, since the Parilia are a *lustratio*, the absolution of involuntary offenses which shepherds and beasts may have committed against the divinities of the field. *Dea pastorum*, Pales presides over all these things, which are guaranteed by the Parilia and which it is not possible to derive from the concept of *partus*.²²

The means of purification, well described by Ovid, are of several kinds: water poured over the fed sheep at dawn, the soil of the sheepfold swept and sprinkled, leafy branches and garlands hung on the fold, but especially fires of various woods and fires of straw through which men and beasts pass rapidly. It is probably into these fires that the characteristic fumigation of the festival is cast, which the Vestals have prepared with three ingredients: the ashes of the calf-embryos burned on the fifteenth in the Fordicidia, horse's blood, and empty beanstalks. It is commonly thought that the first two scatter among men and beasts the essence of the most powerful species of domestic animals, cattle and horses, representing fertility and strength. The beanstalks, emptied of their fruits, cannot be an "infernal" offering, because what the *lemures* and other spirits love in the bean is its fruit and moreover there is nothing to suggest such an orientation of the rites. It is possible—Indian cases utilizing the same

21. The principle of the duplication of Pales, *Palibus II*, is thus akin to that which makes Varro (in Gell. 16.16.4) speak of *duabus Carmentibus*, below, p. 393.

22. As opposed to Latte, p. 88, n. 1.

symbolism have been pointed out—that the key word in Ovid's *culmen inane fabae* is the adjective *inane*, and that the “annihilation” of defilements is expected, through sympathetic magic, from this burned “emptiness.”²³ The ceremony also includes an offering to the goddess, but not a bloody offering: millet seeds and a millet cake, and hot milk.²⁴

It is not known why the annalistic tradition chose the Parilia as Rome's *dies natalis*: on this day Romulus is supposed to have founded his city. Is it because the twin brothers were still regarded as the shepherd-chiefs which they had been in their childhood? Is it because through a phonetical consonance, to which modern scholars have been more sensitive than the ancients, Pales was associated with the Palatine, the first settlement of Rome? Is it because a more archaic connection linked Pales not merely with the health of the flocks and the shepherds, but with that of the entire rural society? At any rate, this attribution has imparted a certain luster to the pastoral feast in literature, and has led the greater number of the ancient authors to regard it as preceding the foundation of the city.

With regard to the divinity's name, it does not have a clear etymology. The mutilation of the horse, *curtus equus*, which one of her rites requires, her connection with the legend of the twins and with the location of Rome have led me to compare her with a figure in Vedic mythology, unfortunately hardly known, *Viśpālā*, that is, “the **Palā* of the *viś* or the *viśaḥ*”—*viś* being, as we know, the principle of the function of the herdsmen-farmers, and in the plural, the actual name of the clans among whom the population is distributed. She belongs to the cycle of the twin gods, and seems to have been conceived as a mare who, during a race, loses a leg which the twins replace. But the differences in the narratives are considerable, and one cannot clarify the obscure by means of the obscure.²⁵

We are ignorant of the circumstance under which, during the war conducted by M. Atilius Regulus against the Sallentini in alliance with the Picentes, *uictoriae pretium templum sibi pastoria Pales ultro poposcit* (Flor. 1.13); a scholiast of the *Georgics* (Schol. Veron. 3.1)

23. “*QII. 1* (‘*Le culmen inane fabae* des Parilia’),” *REL.* 36 (1958): 112–21. For the *sanguis equi*, see above, pp. 220–24.

24. “*QII. 4* (‘*Pūṣan édenté*’),” *Coll. Lat.* 44 (*Hommages à L. Herrmann*) (1960): 315–19.

25. “*Le curtus equos* de la fête de Palès et la mutilation de la jument *Viś-pālā*,” *Eranos* 54 (*Mélanges G. Björck*) (1956): 232–45.

calls the goddess on this occasion *Pales Matuta*, but he is surely confused, since *Mater Matuta* has nothing in common with *Pales*.

Tellus, *Ceres*, *Liber*, and *Pales* delimit the ordinary field of peasant activity. These divinities all have an extensive domain, with several occasions for annual worship and, in actual practice, a continuous action. They administer, and perhaps embody, the very forces which animate agriculture and animal husbandry, beyond the distinctions of particular occasions and species. Somehow they are the articulated, interdependent principles of the third function, whose applications or particular phases are protected by all the other divinities of this level—save *Quirinus*, who is differently oriented. Therefore we cannot be surprised at the place which they seem to have occupied in primitive Roman society.

Animal husbandry and agriculture are not an end in themselves. Their products are not luxuries but necessities, they are foodstuffs. And not merely in the *dapes* and the *epula* of the gods, but day after day in the life of men. A goddess presided over the final episode in the career of cultivated plants and fattened animals. She was *Carna*, whose festival, on 1 June, was called *Kalendae fabariae*, even though the bean was not the only kind of food honored in it. Her name is derived from *caro-carnis* as *Flora's* is from *flos-floris*.²⁶

Macrobius (I.12.32-33) writes: "It is believed that *Carna* presides over the vital organs of man [*uitalibus humanis praeesse*]. Consequently, it is she whom one asks to preserve in good condition the liver, the heart, and in general the organs which are inside the body [*quaeque sunt intrinsecus uiscera*]. . . . *Carna* is offered a soup made of beans and bacon, the foods which contribute more than any others toward strengthening the body [*quod his maxime rebus uires corporis roborentur*]." Ovid (F. 6.101-82) speaks of her at length, though not without considerable irrelevant matter. The entire beginning of the passage, which concerns a nymph named *Crane*, and in which *Carna*, through a play on words, is treated as a goddess of hinges (*cardo*), is no more than a literary exercise. A second part, in which the goddess is still "the nymph *Crane*," nevertheless assigns an appropriate character to her.

26. What follows sums up "*Carna*," *REL* 38 (1960): 87-98. The treatment of this goddess by Latte, pp. 70-71, has been examined in "Religion romaine et critique philologique, 1," *REL* 39 (1961): 87-91; cf. *IR*, pt. III, chap. 2.

In it an infant child suffering from consumption and from "harpies" who are devouring its *viscera* is cured by the goddess, who reveals to the parents a series of magical acts and restores the natural color to the infant's bloodless face. The third part of the passage describes the ritual of 1 June:

You ask why fat bacon is eaten on these Calends, and why beans are mixed with hot spelt. She [Carna] is a goddess of the olden time, and subsists upon the foods to which she was inured before; no voluptuary is she to run after foreign viands [such as rare fishes, oysters, the francolin, the crane, and the flesh of the peacock]. . . . The pig was prized, people feasted on slaughtered swine: the ground yielded only beans and hard spelt. Whoever eats at the same time these two foods on the Calends of the sixth month, they affirm that nothing can hurt his bowels.

From these texts a coherent picture emerges. The archaic and substantial foodstuffs which are combined in the offering as well as in the ritual consummation are regarded as maintaining (Macr.: *salua conseruet*) and developing the physical powers (Macr.: *uires corporis roborentur*), through their incorporation into the essential inner organs of the body (*uitalibus*). Moreover, the ritual consummation on the Calends of June preserves these same organs from every malady (Ov. 182: *huic laedi viscera posse negant*). The apotropaic ritual of Crane-Carna apparently does not belong to the annual festival. But it is likely that in the case of consumption, or wasting away of the *viscera*, the same goddess had to intervene in order to cure the malady which she had not been willing to prevent. It is certainly in this sense that we must interpret the inscription of *CIL*, III, 3893, in which, all other documents being neglected, a reason has been sought for making Carna a goddess of the underworld and her festival a festival of the dead. At Emona, in Pannonia, a man bequeaths his fortune to a *collegium fabrum*, with one condition, *uti rosas Carnariis ducant*. Does not this simply indicate the desire of the deceased, in his love of life, that each year on the festival of the goddess who *uitalibus humanis praeest*, the flower which most closely resembles the complexion of the living cheeks should be offered to his shade as a poetic recalling of his happy years in life, or even in the hope of some kind of re-animation in the other world?

This conception of the goddess has been contested, and replaced by the usual contrivances: moon goddess (R. Pettazzoni); protecting

goddess of the house or of the family (A. Grenier), or at least of the entrance to the house (W. F. Otto). Recently Latte has doubted even the antiquity of the attribution of the festival to Carna, and has interpreted it as a rite celebrating the first bean harvest. But his arguments ring false: the two foodstuffs associated with this day, beans and bacon, have equal importance and symbolize all the foods which are thought to be transformed into *viscera*. That this function of assimilation may produce a divine being is proved by a hymn of the *RgVeda* (1.187) addressed to *Pitú*, that is, to Food personified, which contains expressions very close to Macrobius's definition. The being charged with presiding over and providing for the assimilation of foods is simply derived from the other end of the mechanism. At Rome, Carna receives her name from the *carnes*, the wished-for result of the nutritive process; in India, it is the initial term which is deified, namely, Nourishment, but—such is the force of the suffix *-tu-* — Nourishment considered in its evolution and its final form, in the conjecture and the hope of its transmutation into flesh and bone. It is necessary only to quote from the tenth strophe: "O plant, become flour, fat, (fat of the) loins (?), . . . ? . . . ,—become flesh for us!"

The Vedic hymn gives a valuable indication: in strophes 1, 5, and 6, Food is celebrated as containing physical vigor and transmitting it principally to the warriors, that they may perform deeds of bravery. If it is true, as some ancient authors thought, that the month of June derives its name from the same root as *iuvēnis*, *iunior*, *Juno*, there would be a particular justification for placing the festival of Carna in June, and on the Calends. There would be similar justification for the legend which tells us that Junius Brutus, the father of *libertas*, was the founder of Carna's sanctuary on the western side of the Caelian hill. This legendary figure, *tribunus Celerum* under the last king, that is, holding the highest military rank, was the typical warrior, both in the conspiracy which provoked the expulsion of the Tarquins and in the war which followed it.

In contrast with this impressive representation of the forces which motivate agriculture and animal husbandry, in contrast with Tellus who sustains them and Carna who gives efficacy to their products, the Romans did not assign great importance to the divine role of water.

To be sure, spring water was preeminently the water to be used for lustration (Ov. *F.* 4.778, on the Parilia, with Frazer's commentary, *Fast.* 4: 368; Verg. *Aen.* 2.719, with Servius's commentary; etc.), and the fountains were sacred. The Casmenae, who were later assimilated to the Muses because of the resemblance of their perhaps Etruscan name to *carmen*, were honored in a grove outside of the Porta Capena (Serv. *Ecl.* 7.21), and it is to their spring that the Vestals used to go, day after day, to draw the water necessary for their duties (Plut. *Num.* 13.2). Every year, on 13 October, a public festival, the Fontinalia, was celebrated in honor of the natural springs, into which wreaths were thrown, and of the wells, on which they were placed (Varr. *L.L.* 6.22). The deified Fons, who had an *ara* on the Janiculum (Cic. *Leg.* 2.56), received a temple outside the walls in 231, probably in front of the Porta Fontinalis, and must have been introduced, around the same period, as the son of Janus in the genealogy of the "first kings" of Latium. The affinity between "spring" and "beginning" probably suggested this father-son relationship. A more famous figure, thanks to her role in the *Aeneid*, is Juturna (Diuturna). Originally Lavinian according to Servius (*Aen.* 12.139), but Etruscan in the opinion of several modern authors, she obtained at Rome the patronage of a spring which fed the *lacus Juturnae* in the Forum, adjoining the temple of Castor. She received principally the worship of the various professional groups which used water in their vocations, *qui artificium aqua exercent*. From Greece, through Italic intermediaries, came the nymphs (*Lymphae*, *Lumpae*), the sisters of the deities whom the table of Agnone (Vetter, no. 147), in Oscan territory, lists in the dative case among the auxiliaries of Ceres: *Diumpais Kerriiais* "Lymphis Cerialibus." The Romans, more practical than poetic, assigned them the task of fire-protection (Cic. *Har. resp.* 57), especially during the sacrifices on the day of the Volcanalia. This did not prevent their own temple from burning, at the end of the Republic, through the attentions of Clodius, along with all the administrative documents relating to the census which, for some unknown reason, it contained (Cic. *Mil.* 73). Finally, although the Tiber, *Tiberinus pater*, has neither a flamen nor a very ancient cult, it has been claimed by Mommsen that he can be recognized, under another name, in the god Volturnus, who does have a flamen (Varr. *L.L.* 7.45; Paul. p. 466 L²) and a festival, the Volturnalia (27 August).

But this hypothesis was abandoned,²⁷ and the river was restored to its state of religious indigence until it got its revenge through the works of the poets of the golden age.²⁸

But each of these native or borrowed figures is only the guardian spirit of a particular bit of water. Did the Romans recognize a divinity, on a higher level than these specialists, who represented the general qualities of all water present on the ground, as Tellus represented the earth along with all the varieties of Lares? It is possible. And even this divinity is perhaps very ancient, but through his assimilation to Poseidon he has been so thoroughly remodeled that very little of his true character remains. He is Neptunus. It is generally agreed that in the beginnings he was not the patron god of the sea, which held little interest for the earliest Romans, but there must have been enough of a general nature in his definition to enable him to become Poseidon at the time of the transferences. Beyond this common-sense deduction, all that we know of him occurs in a few scraps of archaeology, theology, and ritual. On the Campus Martius, probably near the Tiber, he had a temple which Livy mentions as early as 207 (28.11.4) and which must have replaced an older altar. His festival fell on 23 July, at the time of the most intense summer heat. During this festival people took shelter from the rays of the sun, not under cloth tents but under arbors of foliage, *casae frondeae*, analogous to the *σκιάδες* in the *Karneia* of Sparta and, like them, called *umbrae* (Paul. p. 465 L²). One of his associates—the other one, Venilia, cannot be interpreted—was called Salacia (Gell. 13.23.2), and the ebullience which this name suggests, the tendency to be *salax* (cf. *pertinacia*, from *pertinax*, etc.), must, according to usage, indicate a characteristic property of the god. This wretched balance sheet is clearly not enough for us to specify the divine type.²⁹

27. J. Carcopino subsequently tried to find in Volcanus an ancient god of the Tiber, who was supposed to have been the great god of Rome, *Virgile et les origines d'Ostie* (1919), pp. 115–20, 129–33, 595–720. Unfortunately he recently republished this work without any mark of repentance.

28. J. Le Gall, *Recherches sur le culte du Tibre* (1953) (pp. 40–56, “Les prétendus dieux du Tibre”); cf. id., *Le Tibre, fleuve de Rome, dans l'Antiquité* (1953).

29. On a possible mythic relationship of Neptunus with the Irish Nechtan and the Indo-Iranian *Apām Napāt*, see my “Le puits de Nechtan,” *Celtica* (Dublin) 6 (1962): 50–61. An attempt to explain the name Venilia has been made in A. L. Prosdocimi, “Etimologie di teonimi: Venilia, Summanus, Vacuna,” *Studi linguistici in onore di V. Pisani* (1969), pp. 777–802. Roman cults of the Moon and the Sun in the ancient period are not well established; see Latte, p. 233, n. 2. *Sol Indiges* is still obscure. C. Koch, *Gestirnverehrung im alten*

SECOND AND FIRST FUNCTIONS

All the divine figures which have just been considered belong to aspects of the "third function," as it has come to be called in comparative Indo-European studies: the rural, alimantal economy, with its foundations of earth and water. Through her own importance and through the political role which she played, Ceres dominates this whole group. "Growth" personified, she is the motive force of the third function, as Quirinus is the patron god of the humans who are involved in it, in the sphere of its social application. Were warlike might and sacred power embodied in divinities by the side of Mars and Jupiter, as the motive force of the two higher functions which they govern?

From the very name for war, *bellum*, *Bellona* was derived.³⁰ At first she seems to duplicate Mars. Her temple, like that of the god and for the same reason, is outside the *pomerium*.³¹ To judge by a third-century cup, which bears the inscription *Belolai pocolom* (CIL, I, 44) and a head with serpents twining in its hair, the assimilation to the Greek Enyo, whom the *Iliad* (5.592) presents as the female counterpart of Ares, is an ancient affair. A no less terrifying *Bellona* appears more lastingly, and in fitting company, on the shield of Virgil's hero (*Aen.* 8.700-703):

Mars, traced in iron, rages [*saevit*] in the thick of the struggle, the grim Furies hover over the combatants, and Discord, her mantle torn, joyously stalks among them, while *Bellona*, armed with a bloody lash, follows her.

Despite these Hellenized frenzies, what we know of *Bellona*'s cult and of her services suggests a divinity less abandoned, less confined to the action of battle than Mars. In other ways than Jupiter, she intervened both in what followed and in what preceded war, as well as in the diplomatic activity which sometimes spared it. It was in her temple that the Senate deliberated the triumphs requested by victorious generals on their return (Liv. 26.21.1; etc.). When the remoteness of boundaries rendered impractical the ancient custom

Italien (1933), stirs up the matter, but proves little. On "naturalism" in the old cults, there is the essay by Diephuis, *Naturkräfte und ihre Verehrung in der altrömischen Religion*, Diss. Utrecht (1941).

30. Dative *Duelonai* at the beginning of the *senatus consultum* on the Bacchanalia.

31. Ov. *F.* 6.191 (cf. Bömer's commentary on 199 ff.); Aust, "Bellona," in *RE* 3: 254-57.

whereby a fetial hurled the first spear into the enemy's territory, it was in front of her temple that the priest performed his rite, above the *Columna Bellica*, on a corner of ground which by a legal fiction was considered hostile territory (Fest. p. 133 L²).³² But it was also in her temple that the Senate granted audience to foreign ambassadors whom it did not wish to admit into the city. Moreover, the Senate held sessions there often enough so that certain theorists referred to it as one of the "three *senacula*" (Fest. p. 435 L²). In particular, it was there that the *senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus* was held, an act of moral war which consisted in the violent expulsion of a foreign cult regarded as a threat to the Roman tradition.

Situated in the Field of Mars, between the sites of the Circus Flaminius and Pompey's theater, the temple of Bellona dated from the first years of the third century, from the time of the Samnite wars which produced so many remarkable votive offerings, to Jupiter Stator, to Jupiter Victor, to Victoria, to Quirinus, the details of which are frequently legendary. The beneficiary of this vow is a granter of victory: "Bellona," cries Appius Claudius Caecus at the height of the battle, *si hodie nobis uictoriam duis, ast ego templum tibi uoueo*. The victory is not slow in materializing, and it is climaxed by the capture of the camp of the Etruscans, the allies of the Samnites. In a final effort, while the soldiers are scaling the palisade and crossing the ditch, Appius again inflames their hearts by repeating incessantly the name of victorious Bellona, *Bellonam uictricem identidem celebrans* (Liv. 10.19.17).³³

In fact, on the basis of her name, Bellona is not war proper, but the goddess who makes the Romans come out victorious in war. As we have seen with Angerona, Orbona, Fessona, and generally with divine names derived from "troublesome" abstract ideas, this is the usual orientation of the suffix *-ona*.³⁴ Bellona naturally fulfills her

32. Other references in Bömer, *Fast.* 2: 348. The artifice is similar to the one by which a corner of ground certified as "Romanus" was established in the Roman camps abroad, so that the general might there *renouare* (rather *repetere*) *auspicia* without having to return to Rome (Serv. *Aen.* 2.178; cf. Fest. p. 371 L²).

33. The circumstances of the vow are as follows: the two consuls are not in agreement, one of them has turned out to be mediocre, the soldiers have intervened in the command, and the two halves of the army have been engaged separately. In short, though the situation is not truly critical, the Roman "war machine" is functioning poorly. The mediocre consul makes the vow to Bellona, and from that moment he and all the others are shown to be equal to their task.

34. Above, p. 335.

mission in battle, where she joins Mars, but she takes a wider view and administers a more extensive domain than the god. It is in this sense that we can recognize in her the fullest expression of the warlike function as it was understood at Rome, while Nerio, if it were necessary to ascribe a consistent character to her, would better represent the motive force of all wars: the energy and ardor of man engaged in battle.

As for the sphere of sacred power, perhaps it has provided mythology with a figure which we know only in an attenuated, degraded, and specialized form: such are the gods of the druids³⁵, who were preserved among the Gallo-Romans but with their activities confined to the healing of illness or the protection of a craft. Vedic India assigned an honorable role to the entity *Vāc*, the voice, or speech, especially religious or magical speech as in the hymn. A poet has glorified this entity in generously pantheistic strophes as the common foundation of all reality, all existence (*ṚgVeda* 10.125 = *AtharvaVeda* 4.30). The Romans honored a goddess whose name at least seems to stem from the same ideology. *Carmentis* (or, less well attested, *Carmenta*) can only be a personification, in the feminine gender, of the *carmen*.³⁵ The minor flamen and the two feast days (11 and 15 January) which are ascribed to her are evidence of her ancient importance, but in the actual religious practice of which we have knowledge, the goddess, like the *carmen* itself (properly religious or magico-religious song), has been reduced to very limited uses.

The legend of the origins took possession of her, and it is only there, probably under Greek influence, that she directed the power of her name toward actual prophecy. The mother, more rarely the wife, of the Arcadian Evander, the first settler of the Palatine, she is supposed to have foretold to him the grandeurs of Rome (Verg. *Aen.* 8.333-41, with Servius's note on line 336, which says that the female

35. The word is either, feminized, a **carmentum* doublet of *carmen* (cf. J. Perrot, *Les dérivés latins en -men et -mentum* [1961]; the description of *Carmentis*, p. 297, n. 1, is not right; and why suppose a popular etymology?), or a formation in *-tis*, *-ta* on *carmen*, *Carmen-tis* (cf. *Juven-ta*). The only exactly comparable word is *sementis* "the action of sowing; sowings" (whence *feriae sementinae*). On *Carmentis*, see L. L. Tels-de Jong, *Sur quelques divinités romaines de la naissance et de la prophétie* (1959) (cf. my review, *Lat.* 20 [1961]: 614-16). The other divinities studied in the book, especially *Parca* (*Parcae*) remain totally mysterious, outside of their *interpretationes graecae*. R. Schilling, *Gnomon* 32 (1960), reviewing Mrs. Tels-de Jong's book, translates *Carmenta* (with *-ta* having the force of *-trix*) as "she who provides the *carmen*."

seers were formerly called *carmentes*; Ov. *F.* 1.471-537; Liv. 1.7.8; etc.) or the fate of Hercules (Strab. 5.3.3; Dion. 1.40), and she is said to have invented the Latin alphabet (Hyg. *Fab.* 277; Isid. *Etym.* 1.4.1 5.39.11). The *sacellum Carmentis* was attributed to the devotion of her son. Dating from the regal era, this *sacellum* gave its name to the *Porta Carmentalis* (Verg. loc. cit., with Servius's note on line 337; etc.).

In this role she is regularly qualified as *Nympha*, thanks to a connection which is often observed between the gift of prophecy and the patronage of waters: to the frequently cited Greek data (Frazer, *Fast.* 2: 5-6), we may add the fact that at a very early date the Indian *Vāc* was herself assimilated to the river goddess par excellence, *Sarasvatī*. But in the actual practice of the republican period, *Carmentis* is of interest to men, or rather to women, because of another power: she is concerned with births. More precisely, says Plutarch (*Rom.* 21.4), "This *Carmenta* is thought by some to be a Fate [*μοῖρα*] presiding over human birth" (cf. Aug. *Ciu. D.* 4.11: *in deabus illis quae fata nascentibus canunt et uocantur Carmentes*). From this particular kind of interest, which it is easy to reconcile with her role as prophetess, *Carmentis* passed over to more technical activities, and some texts made her an actual midwife. But this gives rise to a discussion which, in the present state of documentation, cannot be resolved. The only sure fact is that the goddess bore two opposing cultic *cognomina*, which several authors have interpreted as two additional *Carmentes*, her companions: *Postuorta* and *Prorsa* (Varro in Gell. 16.16.4), *Postuorta* and *Porrima* (Ov. *F.* 1.633; Serv. II *Aen.* 8.336), *Postuorta* and *Anteuorta* (Macr. 1.7.20). Varro and, apparently, Tertullian (*Nat.* 2.11.6) associate these two adjectives with the two extreme positions in which the child about to be born may present itself: favorably, with the head foremost, or unfavorably, with the feet foremost. Ovid, Servius II, and Macrobius associate them with the two directions of clairvoyance, toward the past and toward the future, *quia uatibus*, says Ovid, *et praeterita et futura sunt nota*. Despite the general preference of the moderns for the obstetrical explanation, and despite the ingenuity of the most recent exegete, this explanation encounters more difficulties than the other, vaticinal one.³⁶ But the

36. Frazer, *Fast.* 2: 181, remarks that no dedications to *Carmentis* have been found, a fact which is surprising if we are dealing with a goddess whose principal task is to collaborate in births.

very uncertainty which surrounds this point is adequate proof of the attrition of the goddess, out of her element in a religion which at an early date found little room for personal inspiration, for the *uates*,³⁷ and which put its trust in the accurate action and the clear formula rather than in incantation.

37. Above, pp. 133-35.

ARCHAIC ROMAN RELIGION

WITH AN APPENDIX ON
THE RELIGION OF THE ETRUSCANS

GEORGES DUMÉZIL

TRANSLATED BY PHILIP KRAPP

VOLUME TWO

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY PRESS
BALTIMORE AND LONDON

Originally published in 1966 as
La Religion romaine archaïque suivi d'un appendice sur la religion des Etrusques

© 1966, Editions Payot, Paris

The English translation has been revised and annotated by the author

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper
Originally published in the United States in 1970 as a two-volume set by the
University of Chicago Press

Licensed by the University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois

© 1970 by The University of Chicago. All rights reserved

Johns Hopkins edition, 1996

05 04 03 02 01 00 99 98 97 96 5 4 3 2 1

The Johns Hopkins University Press
2715 North Charles Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218-4319
The Johns Hopkins Press Ltd., London

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Dumézil, Georges, 1898–

[Religion romaine archaïque. English]

Archaic Roman religion : with an appendix on the religion of the Etruscans / Georges

Dumézil : translated by Philip Krapp : foreword by Mircea Eliade.

p. cm.

Originally published : Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-8018-5482-2 (v. 1. : alk. paper).—ISBN 0-8018-5480-6 (v. 1. : pbk. : alk. paper).—

ISBN 0-8018-5483-0 (v. 2. : alk. paper).—ISBN 0-8018-5481-4 (v. 2. : pbk. : alk. paper).

1. Rome—Religion. 2. Etruscans—Religion. I. Title.

BL802.D813 1996

292.07—dc20

96-14884

A catalog record for this book is available from the British Library.

THIRD PART

EXTENSIONS AND
MUTATIONS

II

PERSONIFIED ABSTRACTIONS

The elevation of abstractions, desirable qualities, or powerful forces, *virtutes* and *utilitates* (Cic. *Leg.* 2.28), to the rank of divinities was a game of language and thought in which all the ancient Indo-European societies indulged. The extreme case is that of Zoroastrianism, in which the numerous Indo-Iranian gods were systematically replaced by Entities which expressed the same function, but in a purer fashion; however, certain of these already appear in the ṚgVeda. Archaic Greece and pagan Scandinavia and Ireland took part in this use of abstraction, which was facilitated by Indo-European grammar, with its rich assortment of abstract suffixes, almost all of them feminine. Nor was it neglected by Rome: Ops and Fides belong to the old stock of these personifications. Formed earlier than the Books of the Pontiffs in which Aulus Gellius (13.23.1) read them, so ancient indeed that their meaning is sometimes uncertain, are the female Entities whom the *comprecationes deum immortalium, quae ritu Romano fiunt*, unite with various divinities, of whom they express one aspect or one essential mode of action: *Lua Saturni, Salacia Neptuni, Hora et Virites Quirini, Maia Volcani, Herie Junonis, Moles et Nerio Martis*. The process may also be seen in the Umbrian ritual of Iguvium (*Tursa Çerfia*, etc.). But, in the course of the centuries, the leaders of Rome, heedful of circumstances, adopted this method of setting up divine protectresses for their activities, and private initiative produced other such goddesses. Cicero did not call on his wisdom as a philosopher but on his awareness as a citizen for the excellent explanation of these easy and numerous divine births which he offers (*Nat. d.* 2.61): "What shall we say of Ops? what of Salus? of Concordia, Libertas,

Victoria?¹ As each of these things has a power too great to be controlled without a god, it is the thing itself which has received the title of god."

The origin of such cults is not always known. For instance, we do not know why the consul M. Acilius Glabrio, during the battle at Thermopylae in 191, in which he was pitted against Antiochus the Great, vowed to Pietas the temple which his son dedicated ten years later in the *Forum holitorium* (Liv. 40.34.4). To be sure, the son was performing a public act of *pietas* toward his father on this occasion by erecting to him a gilded equestrian statue, the first that was ever seen; but what had been the father's motive, when he made the vow?² Spes, Pietas's neighbor in the *Forum holitorium*, owed her temple to a vow made by A. Atilius Calatinus during the First Punic War. Spes would obviously occur to the general's mind more readily than Pietas in the heat of battle, and we may easily accept the explanation which Cicero offers (*Leg.* 2.28): *quoniam exspectatione rerum bonarum erigitur animus, recte etiam a Calatino Spes consecrata est*. Moreover, Calatinus was a lover of such Entities; it was he again who raised a temple to Fides, probably on the site of an ancient *sacellum* (Cic. *Nat. d.* 2.61) on the Capitol.

Among the cults of this type we shall examine only two, one because at the time of its foundation it presented a difficult problem, the other because it played an important role, indeed a series of roles, in political life.

1. All these abstractions are found on coins: *Libertas* (cherished by the *populares*) and above all *Victoria* (always, and very early, with crown and palm) are the most frequent. *Salus* represent the safety of the state, in connection with civil wars, on the denarii of D. Silanus L.f. (about 90 B.C.), but is *Hygieia*, the Greek goddess Health, associated with *Valetudo* on a denarius of M. Acilius (about 50 B.C.), reminiscent of the first Greek physician who settled in Rome in 219 and whose shop, given him by the state, was on the *Via Acilia*? Mattingly, *RC*, 68-69 and pl. XV 12.

2. See the "political" hypothesis of Latte, pp. 236-39, concerning *Pietas*, and P. Boyancé's opinion, *La religion de Virgile* (1963), p. 58, n. 2: "The stress on politics emphasizes Latte's almost congenital inability to grasp properly religious meanings." The coins show some remarkable likenesses of *Pietas*. Mattingly, *RC*, p. 69: "The *Pietas* of M. Herennius (c. 108 B.C., pl. XV 11) is explained by the type on the reverse, the Catanaean brothers [Amphinomus and Anapias, who carried their aged parents on their shoulders away from an eruption of Etna] as an allusion to family affection, probably in the reference to the family of the moneyer. On the obverse of Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius, she is identified by her bird, the stork; Metellus won the epithet 'Pius' by the filial devotion which led him to strive to secure the return of his father from exile. . . . On the reverse of denarii of Mark Antony of the Perusine war, the reference is to L. Antonius, the consul, brother of the triumvir, who took the title 'Pietas' in token of his devotion to his brother's interests (c. 41 B.C., pl. XX 8)."

During the last century of the Republic, the cavalry parade on the Ides of July, the *transuectio equitum*, started from the double temple of Honos and Virtus in front of the Porta Capena, quite close to the principal temple of Mars. This sanctuary had a curious history, in which we have the pleasure of seeing the trustees of sacred knowledge and the conqueror of Archimedes at odds over a problem of some significance. Originally the temple belonged to Honos alone, following a vow made by Q. Fabius Maximus Verrucosus during a battle with the Ligurians (233). Later, during the battle of Clastidium against the Cisalpine Gauls, M. Claudius Marcellus vowed to change it into a temple of Honos and Virtus. But in 208, when he tried to make this double dedication, the pontiffs opposed it, without regard for the scruples—in Livy's words, *aliae atque aliae religiones* (27.25.7)—which then filled the mind of the great Marcellus to the point of delaying his departure for the army. They had cogent reasons for this. It is not proper, they said, to dedicate a single *cella* to two divinities other than the *dii certi*, that is, to divinities with strictly circumscribed domains, complementary and thus naturally inseparable.³ In fact, it was necessary to anticipate a certain kind of event which was both frequent and important: the prodigy. If the *cella* were struck by lightning, or if some other prodigy occurred in connection with it, the *procuratio* or neutralization of the evil sign would cause difficulty, as it could not be known which of the two coproprietors of the building should receive the sacrifice, which the ritual books did not allow to be offered to two gods. The unfortunate *uoti reus* got out of this dilemma by hastily erecting to Virtus a second *aedes* adjoining the first, that of Honos. He did not have time to dedicate it. Obligated at last to rejoin his army, he was almost immediately killed in an ambush set by Hannibal. Signs had occurred, however, which should have made him prudent. On the very day of his death, while he was offering sacrifice, the liver of the first victim was found to have no head, while in the second the head of the liver was somewhat enlarged. The *haruspex* did not find altogether promising this appearance of *exta* which were *nimis laeta* immediately after others which were *turpia et trunca*. Thus, at more than sixty years of age, Marcellus was

3. Serv. Aen. 2.141: *pontifices dicunt singulis actibus proprios deos praeesse; hos Varro certos deos appellat*; J. von Dornaszewski, *Abhandlungen zur römischen Religion* (1909), pp. 154-70: "Dei certi und dei incerti."

one of those otherwise religious Roman generals who perished through their failure to obey the entrails. Only seventeen years after his vow, his own son M. Marcellus, who, as a young military tribune, had only been wounded during the engagement in which his father fell, was able to make the dedication of the *aedes Virtutis ad portam Capenam* (Liv. 29.11.13). The monument was famous for the riches which were accumulated in it: the sack of Syracuse had been profitable. A second temple of the same two divinities was later erected by Marius, probably on the Esquiline, this time without occasioning any opposition on the part of the pontiffs (Cic. *Sest.* 116; etc.). Perhaps this double dedication alluded to a double victory, since the *templum Honoris et Virtutis Marianum* was built *de manubiis Cimbricis et Teutonicis*. At any rate, it had a harmonious elegance, which Vitruvius praised in two passages (3.2.5; 7. *praef.* 17).

In spite of these foundations and a few other, less brilliant ones, these two abstractions did not play an important role in the religious thought of the Romans.⁴ The same is not true of Concordia.

In the earliest days of Rome, it does not seem that relations among men, among *gentes*, and probably among the *curiae* and the tribes, had been entrusted to other divinities than *Dius Fidius* and, doubtless at a very early date, well before she had her temple, *Fides*, the gods of good faith and of respect for promises and pacts. In an annual ceremony, an exceptional instance of their joint action, the three *flamens* of Jupiter, Mars, and Quirinus crossed the city in a single closed vehicle and went to sacrifice to *Fides*. This could by no means have been an innovation, since we know of no case in historical times of one of the three great *flamens* being charged with new duties, much less of all three.⁵ What we now know of the meaning of the triad explains the sense of the rite: *fides* was the key to relationships among men, or even among men and gods, within each of the zones and on the level of each of the functions represented by each

4. Mattingly, *RC*, p. 70: "Virtus, the personification of martial valour, is represented by a helmeted head on denarii of M'. Aquillius M'. f. M'. n.; it is the valour of his grandfather, the conqueror of the slaves in Sicily in 101 B.C. (pl. XVII 13) [below, p. 529]. Conjoined with Honos, Virtus appears too on the denarius of Kalenus and Cordius (pl. XV 8). Both coins were probably struck by Caesar as governor of Gaul: hence the military allusions are doubly appropriate. Honos on the denarius of Palikanus is probably the type of public office (pl. XV 9)."

5. Above, pp. 151 and 156.

of the three great gods. Moreover, it was the basis for normal relations among these functions, and consequently for the smooth running of community life and for public harmony. The ideology covered by the names of Jupiter, Mars, and Quirinus ruled out all rivalry among groups of men, since each had his own reason for holding his particular rank. This reason was the same as that in the fable of the limbs and the stomach. According to the legend, it helped to calm the plebs at the time of its first stirrings, but its efficacy was soon to be exhausted.

The distinction between the plebs and the patriciate was in fact of a quite different sort, not of order and harmony, but of rivalry and hostility. By its very nature, it dominated a struggle which could end only with the complete satisfaction of one party and the complete submission of the other. Fides was no longer equal to the task of reconciling the two sides, perhaps because she was too closely tied to the aristocratic cult, but also because the progress of the plebs was made by constantly reopening the questions which the patricians might believe to be settled, and by declaring all compromise agreements to be inadequate and out of date. To fill this need, we see the appearance, in the backwash of the Gallic catastrophe, of an abstraction which is partly equivalent, yet with a different province of jurisdiction. The active wish for understanding, rather than a static respect for agreements—this is what Concordia offers the two great factions whose struggle is constantly being renewed and settled again.

In this new promotion some have claimed to see a reflection of the *ἁμολοία* of the Greek historians, orators, and philosophers, the goddess who had her altar at Olympia. Neither the date nor the circumstances support this identification, nor even the name *Concordia* itself, which is so thoroughly Latin and of which the word *ἁμολοία* was later only an approximate translation.

According to the annalistic tradition, it was in 367 that M. Furius Camillus, the savior of Rome, the formerly intransigent patrician who was converted toward the end of his life into a political liberal, vowed the temple to Concordia.⁶ After difficult years, in which the functioning of the state was hampered by the efforts of the plebs and of their tribunes to gain admission to the consulate, the inevitable

6. There is great uncertainty in everything concerning Camillus. Nevertheless it seems peculiar that the foundation of so conspicuous a temple should have been attributed to him without reason. Cf. A. Momigliano, "Camillus and Concord," *CQ*, 1942, pp. 111-20. On the temple in the northeast part of the Forum, see Lugli, *RA*, pp. 111-12.

happened. The *rogationes tribunitiae*, rejected for years, triumphed, following what Livy calls *ingentia certamina*, and immediately, despite the nobility, the comitia created the first plebeian consul, Sextius, who with Licinius had led the political struggle. The patricians refused to grant *auctoritas* to this title, and the plebeians threatened to secede, adding *terribiles minas ciuiliū certaminum*. But the *discordiae* were calmed by the proposals of Camillus, then dictator. Livy writes (6.42.11-14):

... The nobles gave way to the plebs in regard to the plebeian consul, and the plebs conceded to the nobles that they might elect from the patricians one praetor to administer justice in the City. Thus after their long quarrel the orders were reconciled at last. The senate decided that this was a fitting occasion to honour the immortal gods—who deserved it then, if ever at any time—by celebrating the Great Games, and voted that one day should be added to the customary three; this burden the aediles of the plebs refused to shoulder, whereupon the young patricians called out that they would willingly do it for the sake of honouring the gods. The entire people united in thanks to them, and the senate decreed that the dictator should hold a popular election of two aediles to be chosen from the patricians, and that the Fathers should ratify all the elections of that year.

Book VI ends on these sentences which well express the easing of tensions brought about by this otherwise precarious peace, and although the historian does not mention the temple of Concordia, Plutarch (*Cam.* 42.2-4) gives a dramatic account of the dictator's vow. In open sedition, after a lictor sent by the tribunes of the people had already laid hands upon him while he was dispensing justice on the Forum, he headed for the Senate. Before entering, "turning to the Capitol, he prayed the gods to bring the present tumults to their happiest end, solemnly vowing to build a temple to Concordia when the confusion was over. In the Senate there was a great conflict of opposing views, but nevertheless, the milder course prevailed, concession was made to the people, and permission given them to elect one of the consuls from their own body. When the dictator announced this to the people as the will and pleasure of the Senate, at once, as was to be expected, they were delighted to be reconciled with the Senate, and escorted Camillus to his home with loud applause. On the following day they held an assembly and voted to build a temple of Concordia, as Camillus had vowed, and to have it

face the forum and place of assembly, to commemorate what had now happened."

In fact this famous temple, which was to play a great role in the history of the Republic, was built in the northwest part of the Forum, at the foot of the Capitol. The Senate met there frequently, and a theorist has even been able to identify it as one of the "three *senacula*," the one in which the senators deliberated with the magistrates, as the temple of Bellona was the one in which they received the foreign ambassadors (Fest. p. 435 L²). Here, in 63, Cicero delivered his fourth oration against Catiline, and here, twenty years later, after the murder of Caesar, the knights took refuge to resist the consul Mark Antony.

A goddess like this had a splendid future in such a disturbed state. On several occasions she was even diverted from her proper meaning and honored in a kind of challenge. In 304 a curious man, Flavius, the grandson of a freedman, a scribe, and an apparitor of the aediles, was himself raised to the aedileship; as Livy says, this was a time of open "corruption of the Forum and the Field of Mars." Flavius opposed his insolence to the contempt of the patricians, and was able to touch them on a very sensitive point. Part of their prestige came from the secrecy with which they jealously preserved the formulas of civil law, a monopoly of the pontiffs, and the table of feast days, which controlled all judiciary activity. Flavius divulged the formulas and published the *Fasti* in the Forum. After this masterstroke, "he dedicated a temple to Concordia on the Volcanal, exciting the wrath of the nobles to its highest point." This derisive foundation only heightened somewhat the opposition of the two sides, on one hand the *integer populus, fautor et cultor bonorum*, and on the other, the *forensis factio*, the dregs of society (Liv. 9.46.10). Actually, this *aedes* was only an *aedicula*, which disappeared during the remodeling of the goddess's principal temple, which Augustus ordered.

A no less provocative use of this noble Entity, with a contrary meaning, was made after the savage "physical liquidation" of Caius Gracchus and Fulvius by that intractable patrician, the consul C. Opimius (121). Plutarch writes (*C. Gr.* 17.4-18.1):

... However, what vexed the people more than [these cruelties] was the erection of a temple of Concord by Opimius; for it was felt that he was priding himself and exulting and in a manner celebrating a triumph in view of all

this slaughter of citizens. Therefore at night, beneath the inscription on the temple, somebody carved this verse: "A work of mad discord produces a temple of Concord."⁷

And yet this Opimius, who was the first consul to exercise the power of a dictator, and put to death without trial, beside three thousand other citizens, Caius Gracchus and Fulvius Flaccus, of whom one had been consul and had celebrated a triumph, while the other was the foremost man of his generation in virtue and reputation—this Opimius could not keep his hands from fraud, but when he was sent as ambassador to Jugurtha the Numidian was bribed by him, and after being convicted most shamefully of corruption, he spent his old age in infamy, hated and abused by the people, a people which was humble and cowed at the time when the Gracchi fell, but soon afterwards showed how much it missed them and longed for them.

In this way men very often honored Liberty by imprisoning their enemies, and Fraternity by massacring them.⁸ It is generally admitted that this third sanctuary of Concordia was only a remodeling of the first.

It is notable that these various places of worship, like the one which replaced them under Augustus, were erected close to the Comitium, on the site where, in the spirit of the *foedus* and *Fides*, legend placed the first great reconciliation, that of Romulus and Titus Tatius, the Latins and the Sabines, that is, of the Roman components "of the first and third functions" (Verg. *Aen.* 8.639-41):

The two kings, halting their struggle, stood before the altar of Jupiter, still in arms and holding bowls, and concluded their alliance over a sacrificed sow.

Concordia served at least once more, in those remote times, on this occasion not *domi* but *militiae*. Among the examples of the cool-headedness which the leaders of Rome preserved during the darkest years of the Second Punic War, Livy cites the following (22.33.7; cf. 23.21.7): in 213, it was recalled that a temple had been vowed to Concordia two years earlier by the praetor L. Manlius *per seditionem militarem*, and the city praetor immediately appointed two officials to place the contract for the building on the summit of the *arx*.

7. ἔργον ἀνομίας ναὸν Ὀμονοίας ποιεῖ, which has been elegantly translated: "Vecors facinus Concordiae fanum facit."

8. Cf. the indignation of the Christian polemical writers, such as Saint Augustine, *Ciu. D.* 3.25: *Cur enim, si rebus gestis congruere uoluerunt, non ibi potius aedem Discordiae fabricauerunt?*

During the last century of the Republic, with Sulla and after him, Rome truly knew the horror of internal wars and calculated the benefits of the *pax ciuilis*. At the same time, her intellectuals examined this terrible story in the categories of the Stoic and Pythagorean masters. It was then that the assimilation of Concordia to *ἁμονία*⁹ had its full effect, to the extent that it influenced the accounts of the olden times and the manner in which Livy and the other historians speak of the foundation of Camillus and of the first conflicts between the plebeians and the patricians. Then, through his conception of the *concordia ordinum*, Cicero purified the usage of the word, compromised by so much misuse. Caesar himself, in a rough sketch of what Augustus would achieve, proposed that this idea of internal harmony be restored, the desire and the need for which contributed so greatly to the advent of the monarchy, by breaking its ties with the past. At least this is the meaning which one is tempted to attribute, along with P. Jal, whose excellent study¹⁰ I sum up here, to the plan for a temple to *Concordia Nova*, in 45, which is mentioned only by Dio Cassius (44.4.4) and which events probably caused to be abandoned.

We must wait for the beginnings of the Empire to see the goddess, as she develops this refund political power, being colored by a new, dynastic nuance, *Concordia Augusta*, before becoming a kind of conjugal patroness of the princely family.¹¹ Perhaps, however, this extension to domestic matters had occurred earlier. In his description of the *Caristia*, or *Cara Cognatio*, on 22 February, a festival and banquet at which only members of the family were present, and which took place in an atmosphere of happiness and with declarations of affection, Ovid (*F.* 2.631-32) names Concordia (cf. Val. Max. 2.1.8: *fautoribus concordiae adhibitis*):

... Come none but the innocent! Far, far from here be the unnatural brother, and the mother who is harsh to her own offspring, he whose father lives too long, he who reckons up his mother's years, and the unkind mother-in-law who hates and maltreats her daughter-in-law. . . . Give incense to the

9. K. Kramer, *Quid ualeat ἁμονία in litteris graecis*, Diss. Göttingen (1915); E. Skard, *Evergetes-Concordia* (1931), pp. 67-106.

10. "Pax ciuilis-Concordia," *REL* 39 (1961): 210-31. On the Roman sanctuaries of Concordia, see Platner, *TD*, pp. 137-40.

11. For another point of view, see J. C. Richard, "Pax, Concordia et la religion officielle de Janus à la fin de la République romaine," *MEFR* 75 (1963): 303-80.

family gods . . . (on that day above all others Concordia is said to lend her gentle presence); and offer food, that the Lares . . .

Through this kindly service, Concordia, or at least her function and her spirit, survived paganism. The Christian calendar of Polemius Silvius, in the middle of the fifth century, preserves the festival under the name of *Cara Cognatio*, with a commentary which specifies its intention: it is supposed to bring about that the quarrels which may have divided the members of a family while they were alive may be forgotten at their death (*CIL*, I², 259, and commentary, p. 310).¹²

12. Frazer, *Fast.* 2: 474.

2

THE GODS OF THE NEIGHBORS

Diana, with her beautiful Latin name, is probably not Roman but was given to Rome by its neighbors in Latium. At what moment, and in what circumstances, cannot be specified, although the chronicle of the origins is not sparing of anecdotes. The introduction of the cult may have been connected with one of the military and political movements which placed Rome at the head of the Latin league. The most important of Diana's sanctuaries, that of Aricia in the Alban hills, had in fact served as the center of that league, and it is probable that the cult of Diana established on the Aventine was as it were a Roman replica of the one at Aricia.¹

Diana's file contains various elements, and it must not be stated *a priori* that one of them is primitive and another secondary. Her name, formerly scanned *Diāna*, is based on the adjective *dīus*, which forms a part of several divine names at Rome, *Dius Fidius*, *Dea Dia*; in the neuter, *dīum*, it means "the open sky" (*sub dio*). The sanctuary of Aricia was situated at the edge of a mountain lake, in a wood to which the goddess owed her usual name, *Diana Nemorensis*. Two facts characterized her cult there.

1. A. Alföldi, "Diana Nemorensis," *AJA* 64 (1960): 137-44 (numismatic documents); and, with the earlier bibliography, "Il santuario federale di Diana sull' Aventino e il tempio di Ceres," *SMSR* 32 (1961): 21-39. The author insists on the federal character, *commune Latinorum*, of the Roman sanctuary, not as a branch of the former sanctuary but as a replacement for it; and he does not think that it can be earlier than the beginning of the Republic, about the time of the battle of Lake Regillus. The position of the temple on the Aventine is supposed to be linked to the "extraterritoriality" necessary for a federal sanctuary, and its later connections with the plebs to the "coup d'état" of 456, when the Aventine became the military base for the plebeian revolt. A. Momigliano, "Sul *dies natalis* del santuario federale di Diana sull' Aventino," *Rendiconti Accademia dei Lincei, Sc. mor., stor., filol.*, 8th ser., no. 17 (1962), p. 387. Cf. below, p. 446, n. 1. Some scholars seem to be ready to restore an originally Roman Diana; since historical evidence is lacking, this thesis—every thesis—can also be defended.

Her priest bore the title of king, *rex Nemorensis* (Suet. *Calig.* 35.3). A custom which was definitely ancient rendered this office very precarious. Whoever aspired to the "kingship" had to kill the incumbent in combat after having picked a branch from a certain tree in the sacred wood.² In the classical period, volunteers were found only among men of the lower classes or fugitive slaves, since the ritual maintained its harshness without conferring prestige. One of the perverse actions which Suetonius attributes to the emperor Caligula was his sending of a stronger man to challenge the then *rex Nemorensis*, who he thought had been in possession of the priesthood too long. In spite of Frazer's fine studies, nothing allows us to believe that this *rex* had ever been a real king; but the succession of the *regnum* in the *nemus Dianae*, always potentially open, must express an important trait in the mission or the character of the goddess.³

Second, Diana, whom we must regard as a virgin because of her assimilation to the strictly virginal Artemis, had power over the procreation and the birth of children. Excavations have brought to light a number of votive offerings whose meaning is plain: images of the male and female organs, statuettes of nursing mothers or of women clothed but with the fronts of their bodies exposed.⁴ To mark her festival, on the Ides of August, the women went in procession to her wood, bearing torches, in acknowledgment of services rendered by her (Ov. *F.* 3.263; Prop. 2.32.9). A spring in this wood harbored a kind of nymph, *Egeria*,⁵ whose name relates to the delivery of women (*e-gerere*), and to whom in fact pregnant women came to sacrifice, in order to assure themselves of an easy confinement. Finally, the wood sheltered a masculine spirit, Virbius, who is a complete mystery, and in whom the Hellenizing fable claimed to recognize the metamorphosed Hippolytus.⁶

2. A. Merlin, *L'Aventin dans l'Antiquité* (1906), p. 204, n. 4, on a figured representation of one of these duels; see references in Wiss., p. 248; Latte, p. 171 and n. 2.

3. Those who try to explain the whole of Diana in terms of the "protection of women" cannot justify the presence of a male priest; so Latte, p. 171.

4. On the votive offerings for healing, extremely numerous in the *fauissae* of Latium and Etruria, see P. Decouflé, *La notion d'ex-voto anatomique chez les Etrusco-Romains*, Coll. Lat. 72 (1960).

5. This *Egeria*'s connection with the legendary dictator Manius Egerius, to whom the foundation of the *lucus Nemorensis* was attributed, Fest. p. 263 L², cannot be cleared up; on the latter, see L. Morpurgo, "Nemus Aricinum," *MAL* 13 (1903), cols. 297-368.

6. It is thought that the forbidding of horses inside the sanctuary (Verg. *Aen.* 7.778-79; Ov. *F.* 3.266) favored this assimilation. Wiss., p. 249 and n. 6.

This complex arrangement must have had its origin in a remote prehistory.⁷ Germanic and Indian facts which have recently been collated suggest that the Indo-Europeans were acquainted with a celestial god who was not and could not himself be either king or father, but who guaranteed the continuity of births and provided for the succession of kings. He was a variety of "primordial god" or "framing god" (the first to appear and the last to disappear), whose slow rhythm—the slowness of the world's history—was felt to be in sharp contrast with the brevity of generations and of kingdoms. In the great Indian epic, of which we know today, thanks to S. Wikan-der, that it transposes the gods of a pre-Vedic form of mythology into its principal heroes, the corresponding "framing hero," who is an incarnation of the god Dyauh "Sky," lives through as many generations as he wishes. He has given up being a king and being a father. He has set himself above rivalry for the *rājya* as well as sexual desire. His role is to see to it that in his dynasty there will always be children (not begetting them, but causing them to be begotten as they are needed, through the artifices anticipated by an ingenious system of sacred law) and also to raise up, to exalt a king in each generation, while trying—vainly—to avoid bloody rivalries. In Scandinavia, the celestial god, in some respects one might say the sky god, Heimdallr, is also the "framing god": the first to be born and the last to die. Among the gods, he is not king, and although he begets children, he does so without revealing his identity, for the legal benefit of other fathers. His role is primarily to bring about the birth, through their eponyms, of the various social classes (*præll*, *karl*, *jarl*) in three successive generations, then from the last-named class to cause the birth of the king (*konungr*), and to transmit to him the royal qualities which he had in himself and which he had not developed on his own account. It was apparently a figure and a function of this kind that the Latins honored in *Dī-āna*, who combines in herself, with particular specifications, the world of the sky (*dīum*), continuity made meaningful by the contrast of accelerated successions, the symbolic conferring of the *regnum*, and the patronage of births. If this is so, she becomes another in the already large

7. Dumézil, "Remarques comparatives sur le dieu scandinave Heimdallr," *Etudes celtiques*, 1959, pp. 263-83; cf. "La *Rígsþula* et la structure sociale des indo-européens," *RHR* 154 (1958): 1-9.

number of cases in which Italy is seen entrusting to a female divinity the duties which the Indo-Iranians and the Scandinavians entrusted to a male god.⁸

It is readily admitted that the role played by her temple as the federal sanctuary of the Latins was accidental, due only to the fact that after the destruction of Alba it was Aricia which took over the leadership of the group (Wiss., pp. 247-48). This is not absolutely certain. Diana, as we have just come to know her, was as likely to confer sovereignty or primacy upon one of the confederated states as on one of the individuals who aspired to the *regnum*.

Diana's chapels at Rome, the *diania*, were probably founded in various periods and on private initiative. We know that there were such shrines on the northeast spur of the Caelian, where *gentilicia sacra* were celebrated (Cic. *Har. resp.* 32); at the top of the Ciprius vicus, on the Velia (Liv. 1.48.6—unless this was the first-mentioned shrine); and in the vicus Patricius, between the Cispius and the Viminal (Plut. *Q.R.* 3). Probably they preserved only the most easily transportable aspect of the goddess, her association with births. Thus only women were admitted into the *sacellum* in the vicus Patricius. But the principal sanctuary, the *aedes Dianae* in Auentino, was definitely a public institution. Its establishment was attributed to Servius Tullius, and there is no decisive reason for denying it this antiquity, even though certain modern scholars have suspected this attribution as the "aging" of a later event, a common practice of the annalists when they speak about the regal period.⁹ In this building Diana reproduced the two elements of her Arician character, fertility and politics, less the barbarous rite of the priest-king: here she bestowed her patronage on women, and here she conferred supremacy. On 13 August, the shrine's *dies natalis*—the same as that of the temple at Aricia—the women of Rome washed their heads and carefully combed their hair (Plut. *Q.R.* 100), and it is probable that the Egeria who was lodged, in legend if not in cult, in the wood of the *Casmenae*, and who was described as King Numa's gentle counsellor (Liv. 1.21.3; Plut. *Num.* 13), is none other than the Egeria of the *nemus* at Aricia, come to Rome with her mistress. Moreover, the legend claims, and a

8. *DL*, p. 65, n. 3; see below, pp. 418-19 (Feronia).

9. Above, n. 1 (A. Alföldi); previously Merlin, p. 215: "All that we can affirm is that the transference of the cult of Diana Aricina took place before the second half of the fourth century B.C."

probably authentic inscription declares,¹⁰ that the temple was *commune Latinorum Dianae templum* (Varr. *L.L.* 5.43; cf. Dion. 4.26.4-5). By his persuasive eloquence, Servius Tullius is said to have persuaded the aristocracy of the Latins to acknowledge, through the foundation of this temple, that *caput rerum Romam esse, de quo totiens armis certatum fuerat* (Liv. 1.45.3). That this Diana was essentially, though in a different way than Jupiter, the bestower of sovereignty, is made clear by the anecdote which Livy tells in the same passage. On one of the farms in the Sabine country there was a heifer of astonishing size and beauty, concerning which prophecies were made that imperial power would belong, *ibi fore imperium*, to the nation whose citizens offered it in sacrifice to Diana. Joyful at this occasion *imperii recipiendi*, the Sabine eagerly drove his heifer to Rome and led her to the temple on the Aventine. But the officiating priest had had wind of the prophecy and, like a good Roman, sent the Sabine to purify himself in the Tiber, while he himself hastened to sacrifice the heifer to Diana; *id mire gratum regi atque ciuitati fuit* (Liv. 1.45.3-7).

It is not known why this goddess, the bestower of supremacy, was so particularly beloved by the slaves at Rome that her *dies natalis* was the *dies seruorum* (Fest. p. 432 L²; Plut. *Q.R.* 100). The attribution of the foundation to Servius, who was the son of a slave and the protector of slaves, and whose very name alludes to slavery, provided the ancients with a completely reasonable explanation, which, however, we cannot accept. Wissowa's suggestion (p. 350) is still the least artificial: since the Latin Diana was the first foreign divinity to be admitted to Rome, the slaves, most of whom must have been Latins themselves, would have been that much more attracted to this free cult. But even this explanation is not very satisfactory.¹¹

Later the Roman Diana, like the Arician, was assimilated to Artemis and was enriched by all the complex nature of the Greek goddess, by her relationships, and by her history. Diana's virginity and the fact of her dwelling on a wooded mountain probably determined this assimilation, which may have begun near Capua, in Diana's sanctuary on Mount Tifata. At any rate, by the beginning of the fourth century,

10. Merlin, pp. 209-11.

11. Latte, p. 170, claims that in the beginning Diana was only a lunar goddess, a *Mondgöttin*—of which there is no indication, before the development of her assimilation to Artemis—and that all the rest came as an aftergrowth. It is hard to imagine how.

she was sufficiently Hellenized to figure, in a curious pairing with Hercules, in the first collective lectisternium.

Castor is a unique case in the religious experience of the Romans. A foreign god, coming from some point in Magna Graecia to Latium, he penetrated from there into the Roman *pomerium* and was installed closer to the *aedes Vestae* than any national god.¹² The Romans were aware of this anomaly, since they justified it by an account, completely Greek in substance, in which Castor and his brother themselves determine the location of their cult, while men had only to follow their directions. Here are the legendary circumstances surrounding this imperious entry.

In 499, during the battle near Lake Regillus, on Tusculan territory, in which Rome faced the Latin coalition, the dictator A. Postumius, seeing his foot soldiers wavering and exhausted, ordered his cavalry to dismount and fight on foot shoulder to shoulder with the worn-out infantry. The Latin line wavered and then broke; the Roman cavalry remounted and began the pursuit, followed by the infantry. So as not to neglect any divine or human aid, Postumius vowed a temple to the horseman Castor, and promised rewards to the first two soldiers to enter the enemy camp. The victory was not long delayed; the dictator, along with his Master of the Horse, returned to Rome in triumph (Liv. 2.20.10-13), and a few years later the temple was dedicated. In a variant version the vow is replaced by a theophany. At the critical moment of the battle, two horsemen appeared, handsomer and larger than the others, mounted on white horses and clothed in the purple *trabea*. On the same evening these two horsemen, in the same dress, were seen in the Forum. They watered their horses at the fountain of Juturna, announced the victory, and vanished (Dion. 6.13.2). This second version of the story transfers to Rome a method of intervention by the Dioscuri which was known in both Greece and Magna Graecia. Some years before the battle of Lake Regillus, in the battle of Sagra, the twins, dressed in red chlamyses and mounted on white horses, had suddenly appeared in the same way in the ranks of the Locrians; they contributed to the defeat of the Crotonians and then disappeared, while the news

12. Lugli, RA, pp. 179-83.

of the event spread instantaneously to Sparta, Athens, and Corinth (Justin. 20.3).

Actually, until the time when Roman religion was turned over to the Hellenizers, the shrine in the Forum belonged to Castor alone; his brother Pollux remained in the shade.¹³ In a recent article,¹⁴ Robert Schilling clarifies this point very well. The two Greek Dioscuri were fine athletes, but with different specialties. Polydeukes excelled with the cestus, and Kastor in the hippic games.¹⁵ Thus the latter, and he alone, was qualified to become the patron of the cavalry, the body of troops which won distinction through Postumius's tactics, while Pollux's fists remained unused. Accordingly Castor entered Rome as the model and the patron of the *equites*. The cult attests this conception: witness the sacrifice described by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (6.13.4) at Castor's temple at the time of the *transvectio equitum*, the cavalry parade established in 304 by the censor Q. Fabius Maximus, in which every 15 July the young horsemen rode from the Porta Capena to the Capitol, from Mars to Jupiter.

Until recent years there was a tendency to look for the origin of the Roman Castor in Tusculum. But in 1959 F. Castagnoli published an archaic dedication found at Lavinium "outside the ancient city, in the place called Madonnella" (SMSR 30 [1959]: 109-17). The inscription, in two lines written from right to left, reads *Castorei Podlou-queique quirois*.¹⁶ Schilling observes (p. 184) that Juturna, so closely associated with the twins in the legend of Lake Regillus, as well as topographically, in their cult, also came to Rome from Lavinium, where there was a spring named for her. Nowhere, he writes, does the Roman conjunction of the Dioscuri and Juturna seem to have had a "precedent" as clear-cut or in such close vicinity as at Lavinium. Nonetheless the Roman cult is still original. At Tusculum and at Lavinium, as well as among the other Italic peoples to whom they were known, the Dioscuri appear together in their character as "sons of Zeus": *iouiois puclois* on a bronze from Sulmo of the Paeligni

13. As a joke, one of Caesar's colleagues in the consulate, seeing Caesar winning universal popularity, compared himself with Pollux. Suet. *Caes.* 10.2.

14. "Les Castores romains a la lumière des traditions indo-européennes," *Coll. Lat.* 46 (*Hommages à G. Dumézil*) (1960): 177-92.

15. As early as Hom. *Od.* 11.300: *Καστορά θ' ἱππόδαμον καὶ πύξ ἀγαθὸν Πολυδεύκεα*. On the Indo-European prehistory of the twins (Wikander), Schilling, pp. 187-91, Dumézil, *ME* 1: 73-89, Donald Ward, *The Divine Twins, Folklore Studies*, vol. 19 (1968).

16. S. Weinstock, "Two Archaic Inscriptions from Latium, 1," *JRS* 50 (1960): 112-84.

(Vetter, no. 202), [i]ouies pucle[s] on a stone in Marsian territory (ibid., no. 204), *tinās cliniīaras* on an Etruscan mirror, and now *quirois*, a truncated transcription of *Διοσκούροis*, at Lavinium. At Rome, on the other hand, every connection with Jupiter is severed, and while Pollux dwells in the shadow of his brother, it is the latter, Castor the horse-man, who has taken possession of the ground and of the cult.

As for the method by which the young god was established, it is still a mystery. There is no known procedure by which this *peregrinus* or his associate Juturna could have been installed inside the *pomerium*.¹⁷ But it is certain that there were particular ties in existence between Rome and Lavinium in very early times.

It is not known when or how the cult of Feronia was introduced to Rome, along with a temple on the Field of Mars. A calendar fixes its *dies natalis* on the Ides of November (CIL, I², 335). Feronia makes only a brief appearance in the accounts of the historians. At the time of great distress in 217, while all the great Junos of Rome were being supplicated by the state or by the matrons, the freedwomen were invited to combine their resources for an offering to this goddess. Her connection with the *libertae* is confirmed by the unique dedication in her name that has been found at Rome itself and that was made by an *ancilla* (CIL, VI, 30702).

Outside of Rome, her cult is widely represented in Italy. Inscriptions place her at Amiternum on the borders of the Sabines and the Vestini, among the Picentes, at Pisaurum in Umbrian territory, and at Trebula Mutuesca among the Sabines. The writers speak of her temples at Terracina in Campania, and especially near Capena, at the foot of Mount Soracte, where the lands of the Etruscans, the Sabines, and the Latins met. The cumulated facts, which are scattered but sufficiently numerous and with a convergent meaning, give the following picture of the goddess.¹⁸

17. Perhaps, as P. Catalano suggests, SSR, pp. 156-58, 287-80, the solution is to be found in the distinction between *sacra peregrina* and *sacra extera*; unfortunately, this distinction is hard to specify.

18. The two most important recent works on Feronia are P. Aebischer, "Le culte de Feronia et le gentile Feronius," *RBPhH* 13 (1934): 5-23; R. Bloch and G. Foti, "Nouvelles dédicaces archaïques à la déesse Feronia," *RPh*, 27 (1953): 65-77. The latter is based on the excavations which led to the identification of the *lucus* at Capena. For another interpretation, incompatible with R. Bloch's views and my own, see J. Heurgon, *Trois études sur le Ver Sacrum*, Coll. Lat. 26 (1957): 11-19 (1. "Un ver sacrum étrusque? Les origines du *lucus Feroniae*").

All her places of worship are outside of and at a considerable distance from the cities. The ancient Capena and the *lucus Feroniae*, as Raymond Bloch has shown (pp. 65, 74), were located along the stream called the Capenas, the present-day Gramiccia. The city had been built on a hill, approximately eight kilometers from the confluence of this river and the Tiber, and five kilometers northwest of the modern Capena, while the sanctuary was built only one kilometer from this confluence. Thus there was quite a distance between the sanctuary and the city. In Campania, the *fanum Feroniae* was located at the third milestone from Terracina (ps. Acro in Hor. *Serm.* 1.5.24).

Her sanctuaries also occur in woods. Although we cannot make this statement about the sanctuaries known only from epigraphy, it is certainly true of the one at Capena (*lucus Feroniae*; *lucos Capenos* in Virgil), and probably true of the one at Terracina (Aebischer, p. 6). At Rome itself, on the Field of Mars, her temple was likewise supposed to be in a *lucus*, according to an inscription (G. Gatti, *NS*, 1905, p. 15). On a third-century B.C. inscription found on the site at Capena, R. Bloch even thinks that he can restore the word *tesco* (pp. 67-68); *tescum*, an old religious term said to be of Sabine origin, designated a place consecrated to a divinity, but an uncultivated, wooded place, sometimes wild in appearance (Varr. *L.L.* 7.10: *loca quaedam agrestia quod aliquotius dei sunt, dicuntur tesca*). Unfortunately, the restoration is very uncertain.¹⁹

The goddess insisted on this remoteness from cities and on her solitude. It is not without reason, says Servius, that Virgil writes concerning the Campanian sanctuary (*Aen.* 7.800) *et uiridi gaudens Feronia luco*. The sacred wood once burned in an unexpected fire and the inhabitants were about to remove the divine statues from it in order to take them elsewhere, but all of a sudden it became green again. Thus, threatened with being saved at the price of removal from her natural home, Feronia chose to perform this miracle. Elsewhere she expresses her taste and preference for solitude in another way. Pliny says (*N.H.* 2.146), "In time of war, towers are no longer erected between Terracina and the sanctuary of Feronia, because without exception, *nulla non earum*, they have been destroyed by

19. A man's name might rather be expected here, *tesco saluod*, the dedicatress thanking the goddess on the occasion of the curing of X.

lightning." Thus the goddess rejected all continuity and all interdependence with the nearby city.

In these various places and at other points in Italy where modern toponymy preserves her memory (Ferronia, Ferogna: Aebischer, p. 23), Feronia possessed a spring.

The excavations of the *lucus* at Capena have yielded a number of votive objects which prove that curative powers were attributed to her: feet, hands, heads, and eyes of terra-cotta, enameled figures of babies, and, in great abundance, statuettes of beasts of burden (Bloch, pp. 65-66, 76 n. 6). Certain glosses, which there is no reason to suspect, in spite of Wissowa (*RE* 6 [1909], col. 2219), describe her as *dea agrorum* (Glos. Lat. IV, 238, 25; 342, 18; V, 599, 27; to which, through an etymological play on words, V, 456, 23 and 500, 47 add *inferorum*). This may be understood either as a reference to her "agrestis," "anti-urban" nature (*ager* is a regular opposite of *urbs*) or, more positively, as a definite contribution to the fertility of the fields. This is the meaning of the *primitiae frugum* (Liv. 26.11.9) which the citizens of Capena brought to the temple in their *lucus*, and also of the "fair" held in this place, which was famous throughout Italy and which attracted throngs of farmers, craftsmen, and merchants (Dion. 3.32.1).

Everywhere, as is declared by literary tradition or revealed by the inscriptions, the goddess exercises a patronage over the enfranchisement of slaves. At Terracina there is the most striking evidence of this, but as Latte has shown, this evidence is the least free of Greek influence. There, according to Servius (*Aen.* 8.564), she was *libertorum dea*, and in her temple the slaves, with shaved heads, received the *pileum*. Servius II adds that there was in the temple a stone seat bearing the inscription: *bene meriti serui sedeant surgant liberi*. The measure taken by the Roman freedwomen in 217 has been cited above, and R. Bloch has published (p. 70) the dedication made by a *liberta* at the *lucus* of Capena shortly before Hannibal passed through. This may be compared with the no less archaic dedication made by a *libertus* at Trebula Mutuesca and with the dedications made by a *servus* and an *ancilla* of the imperial era (*ibid.*).

Finally, despite her goodwill toward men, Feronia is locally associated or linked in legend with violent or disturbing gods or heroes. The only other god at Trebula Mutuesca with an attested cult is a

frankly warlike Mars (Jul. Obs. 42), and the mysterious *picus Feronius* (Fest. p. 308 L²) recalls the *picus Martius* at Tiora Matiene which is mentioned by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1.14.5). On Mount Soracte she is so close a neighbor of the savage *Soranus pater* that Strabo (5.2.9) refers to her the frenzied ritual of that god's worshipers, the ruffianly Hirpi Sorani, who walked barefoot on glowing coals without suffering injury. At Praeneste, probably through a local tradition, Virgil makes her the mother of the redoubtable Herulus, the hero with three lives who had to be killed three times (*Aen.* 8.563-67).

Many explanations of this complex divine figure have been put forward. As usual, they present one of her characteristics as primitive and attempt to derive the others from it.²⁰ I believe that not enough attention has been paid to those features which were first pointed out in these pages: the installation of Feronia outside of the cities, especially in the wild region near Capena, and the refusal of the goddess either to leave such places or to allow them to be joined even symbolically with the nearest city by any intermediate constructions. The whole dossier can be understood, it seems to me, if one takes these features as one's point of departure. A goddess of another type than Faunus, Feronia yet shares this localization with him. She patronizes "nature," the still wild forces of nature, but in order to put them at the disposal of men, for their nourishment, their health, or their fertility. Also, although she is a near neighbor of Soranus pater and Mars, although she is the mother of Herulus, still, like the Roman gods Silvanus and Faunus, she has her own sphere of activity in agriculture. Possessed of immense stores of vitality, she fecundates and heals. The fact that she receives the first fruits of the harvest does not prove her to be a technician of growth, of the type of Ceres. Considered in the context of her whole range of activities, this fact can be more readily understood through the recognition of a more basic service, the transformation of the *incultum* into the *cultum*, the taming of the normally disorganized forces of vegetation, and the miraculous "leafing out," of which she gives a fine example in her own *lucus*. Established in the "backwoods," she summons to her

20. Notably W. Mannhardt (*Getreide-Erntegöttin*), G. Wissowa, P. Aebischer (*Quellgöttin, a kind of nymph*), F. Altheim (a variety of *Terra Mater*).

fair the neighboring peoples, Sabines and Romans, and those from more distant places, and furnishes them with a kind of neutral ground for their exchanges, the peace of which was never to be troubled (Dion. 3.32.1-2). But, despite what may sometimes have been thought, she has no political or federative power in the style of Diana.

Finally, it is this whole context which must clarify her intervention in enfranchisements. Is the slave a man? His entry into slavery makes him as unfit for any legal action as a dead person: *servitus morti adsimilatur*, in the words of the jurists. According to an opinion recorded by Varro (R.R. 1.17.1), the "instruments" of agriculture are of three kinds: *instrumenti genus uocale et semiuocale et mutum, uocale in quo sunt serui, semiuocale in quo sunt boues, mutum in quo sunt plaustra*. Reread the terrible twenty-first chapter of Plutarch's *Cato* for an understanding of what enfranchisement represents: in legal terms, an actual transition from nothingness into being, and in moral terms, the transition from a higher form of animality to the condition of man. Feronia is not a technician of enfranchisement, for which Rome has its special procedures (*uindicta, censu, testamento*); but, since in all things she permits a taming of that which is savage, so in religion she presides over a social change which must necessarily be perilous both for the former *instrumentum uocale* and for the group into which he is integrated.

Those who are familiar with the religions of India will have noticed the analogy of this description and these functions with those of a Vedic and post-Vedic god, *Rudrá*, whose name has been mentioned above in connection with the Roman Faunus. Rudra is the god of everything that has not yet been taken over by civilization, of what the Latins call *rude*,²¹ a word which is probably related to his name. He is generally the god of the brushwood or of the jungle, constantly dangerous and irreplaceably useful, "master of the animals" (India takes little interest in agriculture), and, thanks to the herbs in his domain, as powerful a healer as the *Aśvin* doctors. He is the protector, not of the freedmen, but of the outlaws, the men of the backwoods,

21. The comparison of *rudis* and *Rudrá* is found in W. Wüst, *Rudrá*, *m. n. pr.* (1955), p. 39 (the connection is the one which is observed, in Sanskrit itself, between *śuci* and *śukrá* "shining"). This little work reviews the various other etymologies which have been suggested.

even of brigands.²² Remove the malevolent and dangerous elements from this divine police blotter, or change them into "good," and the results will be something very close to Feronia.²³

The name of the goddess is easily interpretable. Despite numerous authors, despite the recent hypotheses of J. Heurgon, it is unlikely that Feronia is Etruscan. On the contrary, R. Bloch has offered compelling reasons for restoring her to the Italic peoples, to the Sabines. She is one of the group of divinities whose names are derivatives in *-ōna*, *-ōnia* of a substantive designating a difficult or dangerous situation or moment and who are the mistresses of such a situation for the sole purpose of helping men to extricate themselves from their difficulty or to get the better of it. The chief divinities of this group have been mentioned above, in connection with the goddess who helps men escape from the *angusti dies* of the winter solstice, *Angerōn(i)a*.²⁴ All that has just been said about Feronia suggests the derivation of her name from the word which in Latin is *fērus*, with a short *ē*. In all the other Indo-European languages in which it occurs, this word is spelled with a generalized long *ē*: Greek *θῆρ*, *θηρίον*, Old Slavic *zvěřī*, Lithuanian *zvēris*. The *ē* in Feronia is also long (Greek variants with *ε* and *ο* are obviously based on false etymologies), and it is possible that in contrast with Latin, the Italic, probably Sabine dialect in which the name was formed had the generalized long vowel quantity, like Greek and Balto-Slavic.²⁵ The primary meaning of *ferus* is "non cultus, non domitus" (*Thesaurus*), "agrestis, silvester, indomitus, nullo cultu mitigatus" (Forcellini), and Paulus Diaconus (p. 203 L²) glosses *ferus ager* by "incultus." Are we not once more in the setting which delighted the Feroniae of Terracina and Capena, and from which the latter directed her powers in accordance

22. By and large, this is the description given by E. Arberman, *Rudra, Untersuchungen zum altindischen Glauben und Kultus* (1922). But the very complex Rudra goes beyond this definition. Other aspects are studied notably in J. W. Hauer, *Der Vṛātya, Untersuchungen über die nichtbrahmanische Religion Altindiens* (1927), and in S. Wikander, *Der arische Männerbund* (1938), pp. 69-74 (criticizing Arberman's separation of Rudra and the Marut).

23. The great difference between Rudra and Feronia is that the former is ambivalently placed on the two sides of "Wildnis," inclining chiefly to the alarming side, whereas Feronia has no other reason for being than to put the powers of the "Wildnis" at the service of man and to neutralize its perils.

24. Above, pp. 335, 391.

25. W. Streitberg, "Die Entstehung der Dehnstufe," *IF* 13 (1894): p. 327. If anything in the contents of *Fēronia's* dossier pointed to a goddess of the dead, one might envisage a connection with *fēralis*; but there is no such suggestion (the definition of certain glossaries, *dea inferorum*, is only an etymological play on words).

with the interests of men? Are we not also very close to the Latin *rudis*, the root of which seems to have provided the name of the Vedic *Rudrá*?

Be this as it may, the historical and archaeological fate of the *lucus* of Capena deserves to be reported. At the time of the Second Punic War the temple was at its most splendid, enriched by centuries of offerings. In 211 Hannibal crossed the Anio, and twice, at the very moment when he was about to engage the army defending Rome in a decisive battle, a torrential storm prevented the conflict. Shortly afterward he learned from a prisoner that the piece of land on which he was encamped had just been sold at auction in Rome, and that his occupation of it had not caused any reduction in price. Enraged at the malevolence of the gods and the insolence of men, he took vengeance in the following manner (Liv. 26.11.8-10):

... he moved his camp back to the river Tutia, six miles from the city. Thence he proceeded to the grove of Feronia, a [sanctuary] which at that time was noted for its wealth. The people of Capena and others who lived near it used to carry thither first-fruits and gifts in addition according to their means, and had kept it richly adorned with gold and silver. Of all those gifts the temple was at that time despoiled. Great heaps of bronze [*aeris acerui*] were found after the departure of Hannibal, since the soldiers inspired by religious fear deposited crude lumps [*rudera*]. As to the spoiling of this temple there is no uncertainty among the historians.

In 1952 the archaeologists who had succeeded in identifying the site of the *lucus*, near the castle of Scorano, uncovered important materials in a trench measuring fifty-four meters in length by eight in width, which was certainly part of the sanctuary. But there were no metal objects in this find. About forty small bases of stone (*macco*) were collected, from which the statuettes, probably of bronze, had been torn in ancient times (none of these statuettes has been discovered); on the upper surface of some of these bases the leaden soldering was still present. "It is very tempting," writes Bloch (p. 75), "to suppose that the disappearance of every metal object from the *fauissa* at Scorano and the removal of the bronze statuettes from their *macco* bases are due specifically to the sacking by the Carthaginians. Hannibal's soldiers must have plundered everything of metal, gold, silver, or bronze. But religious fear made them leave in our *fauissa* whatever did not excite their greed, the bases of statues, vases, or

votive offerings of terra-cotta. . . . The body of materials found in the *fauissa* seems to support such a hypothesis, since the objects which can be precisely dated, such as the Campanian vases, must be attributed to the third century B.C. . . . Moreover, this is the very first archaeological evidence, to our knowledge, of Hannibal's presence on Italian soil."

Venus raises a particular problem. Her name is obviously an old abstract neuter, which has passed into the feminine gender (a fact which is apparent only in the accusative case), and from which the verb *uenerari* (*uenerare*) is derived, just as *operari* is derived from *opus*. While holding fast to these morphological certainties and observing the proper shade of meaning of *uenerari* among the words which express piety, Rober Schilling has proposed for the almost unattested neuter **uenus* a plausible meaning, but one which it is difficult for us to exhaust in a single word.²⁶ In ancient times *uenerari* was used only to express an impulse, or even more, an attitude of man toward the gods: not a proposal of the *do ut des* type, not a contractual prayer based on *ius* and *fides*, but an effort to charm and capture the goodwill of the god. *Venerari* is to strive to please the god in the hope of receiving in return, without bargaining, another form of kindness, his *uenia*. It is certainly not a religious act of love, of *bhakti*, which this verb designates: Roman piety has no place for effusiveness. Nevertheless, the *ueneror* of the formulas adds to the general *precor* a feeling of conquering confidence, which tries to be tempting, and to which it is hoped that the divine recipient will offer no resistance. Such must have been, in this religious usage, the sense of the vanished substantive **uenus*. Doubtless this word was applied to other orientations of

26. *La religion romaine de Vénus depuis les origines jusqu'au temps d'Auguste* (1954), pp. 13-64. I personally tend to lessen the magical element and to amplify the affective element of the description proposed by the author; see now *IR*, pt. III, chap. 1. Schilling made a pertinent reply to criticisms (A. Ernout, P. Grimal) in "Les origines de la Vénus romaine," *Lat.* 17 (1958): 3-26. Latte, p. 183, n. 4, approved Schilling's position, but without understanding the (reciprocal) relationship which it establishes between *ueneratio* and *uenia*. Schilling brought the matter to a head in "La relation Venus-uenia," *Lat.* 21 (1962): 3-7. Finally, to Lejeune's criticisms and new proposals, Schilling replied in an article in *Hermes* 93 (1965): 233-43 (see especially, at the suggestion of E. Laroche, the important rectification of the meaning which Lejeune ascribed to Hittite *wangi*: not "futuait," but "he seduces"; it is also necessary to revise the interpretation of Vedic *-vanas*). Cf. C. Koch, "Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der römischen Venusverehrung" (1954), reprinted in *Religio*, 1960, pp. 39-93.

the same attitude: more magical, more compelling in the derivative *uenēnum* (**uenes-no-*), which translates *φίλτρον*; in profane contexts, too—and it may be imagined that feminine charm with its cunning approach, so powerful over its masculine objects, was designated by the same word as the *captatio* of the god by man. Hypothetical, to be sure, yet this explanation is the most likely that has been set forth so far. It is this **uenus* which was personified, and in the feminine gender, which was particularly suited to signify all kinds of forces. Spontaneous evolution? An artifice to obtain for Rome and for the Latin vocabulary an equivalent of the Greek enchantress, Aphrodite, or of her Etruscan shadow, Turan? Such an influence is more than likely. In the south of Italy, where they too encountered Aphrodite, the Oscans gave her a different but no less learned translation. It is also properly an abstract substantive, *Herentas*, based on the root *her-* “to wish,” somewhat as the Latin *uoluptas* (rather than *uoluntas*) is based on the root of *uelle*. Thus, from the very first manifestations of Venus, one must think of the Foreign Goddesses, and ultimately of the Foreign Goddess, who gave rise to her. Actually, before the third century only one of her cults was known at Rome, under the name *Calua*, which concerns feminine charm in one of its aspects which for a long time was undisputed, the hair. Whether in commemoration of the action of the matrons who sacrificed their hair during the Gallic siege in order to make ropes for the war machines, or “under the reign of Ancus,” in the hope that the queen and the other women might recover their hair which they had lost in an epidemic, a statue is said to have been erected to the “Bald Venus,” which is perhaps to be understood as “the Venus of the Bald Women.”²⁷ But, except for this early and obscure act of piety and, apparently, Venus Obsequens,²⁸ the Venuses of Latium and Rome are dominated by the legend of Troy. We shall meet them again later on.²⁹

27. Schilling, *La religion romaine de Vénus* . . . , pp. 65–66; cf. pp. 83–89 (“L’origine probable du culte de Vénus”). Earlier F. Böttzler, *RhM*, 1928, pp. 188–98, who is too negative, and, in the third essay of my collection *Tarpeia* (1947), pp. 192–93. *Calua* is a good Latin word, with only one meaning: “bald.” Latte’s etymology, p. 186, n. 4, taking up a play on words made by certain ancient authors (“die den Wunsch vereitelt”: from the verb **caluio*, *caluor* “to look for subterfuges; to trick”), and the contrast *Calua-Obsequens* which he tries to establish, are artificial. It is impossible to study here all the varieties of Venus with which the Romans provided themselves. Schilling’s interpretations (*Obsequens*, *Verticordia*, *Libitina*) satisfy me; cf. G. C. Picard, “Venus funéraire et Libitina,” *MEFR*, 1939, pp. 121–35.

28. Below, p. 453.

29. Below, pp. 471–73.

The origins of Fortuna are unknown. If it is admitted in general that she came to Rome from other points of Latium, this is because in fact ancient cults of the goddess, more prestigious than those of Rome, existed at Praeneste and Antium, of which at least the former influenced the Roman cults. But this does not prove that the Romans had not independently and in their own fashion defied this transparently named abstraction at all times so alive in their language, and primarily with the meaning of "good fortune, luck." Be this as it may, she did not cease to receive new, often picturesque cults, under particular names which the legends explained as best they could and which the ancients fully catalogued. The concept itself inclined to such a parceling out.³⁰ The influence of the Greek representations of *Tύχη*, improbable in the beginnings, is later positive, from the time of the first Hellenizing poets.³¹

30. Above, p. 39.

31. See the detail in Latte, pp. 176-83 (p. 176, on the Fortuna Primigenia of Praeneste, highly improbable); p. 179, worthwhile psychological comments: "... Aber in den Römern ist dieses Gefühl für die Unsicherheit und Wandelbarkeit der irdischen Dinge nicht wirklich lebendig. Die Unberechenbarkeit des Geschehens, die in der griechischen Tyche einen unpersönlichen Ausdruck gefunden hat, ist hier eigentlich aufgehoben in jenem optimistischen Anspruch, der auch sonst römische Religiosität bezeichnet." On the aporia "Fortuna Primigenia [the only meaning of which is 'primordial,' not 'first born'] puer Jouis," see the third essay of my *DL*.

3

THE GODS OF THE ENEMY

Except for short periods, the life of Rome was not peaceful, and although it is hard to believe that she was powerful enough under the third king to destroy Alba and take that city's place, it is certain that the Republic inherited from the kingdom not only considerable strength but also a fully awakened instinct: *tu regere imperio populos* . . . Wars, victories, and conquests greatly enriched the divine world of Rome.

In the beginning there were doubtless many ways in which the gods of captured or destroyed cities were incorporated into the religious life of Rome, and later they were modified, so that the *ex post facto* systematizations proposed by the scholars of the last centuries of the Republic fail to give an account of cases which are nevertheless well known.

The most famous of these, and one of the oldest, is the *euocatio*.¹ The Romans were convinced that every city was *in alicuius dei tutela*. Thus, toward the end of a siege, when they were on the verge of capturing a city, they addressed its tutelary god or gods in a traditional formula, *certo carmine*, inviting them to abandon and condemn their own country and side with the attackers, and promising them equal or greater honors at Rome (Macr. 3.9.2; Plin. *N.H.* 28.18, based on Verrius Flaccus). They did this either because they did not think they could complete their victory without the conversion of these gods, or *propter euitanda sacrilegia* (Serv. *Aen.* 2.351), because they believed that it was *nefas deos habere captiuos*. A sacrifice was then

1. The documentation is collected, with sometimes very personal interpretations, in V. Basanoff, *Euocatio* (1949), chaps. 1 ("Doctrines des textes romains") and 2 ("Euocatio dans la tradition").

made, and the examination of the *exta* showed whether or not the Roman proposal was accepted (Macr. 3.9.9).

Macrobius reproduces (ibid. 7-8) the text of the *carmen* of *euocatio*, which is carefully distinguished from the *carmen* of *deuotio* of the enemy cities (ibid. 9). But, as the particular application of it which he gives relates to the late and doubtful *euocatio* of the protecting divinities of Carthage, some have hesitated to accept the formula itself, even though it presents the same archaic symmetry that is found, for example, in the prayers to the Tursa of the ritual of Iguvium. The divinities, and especially the chief god, are requested *ut uos populum ciuitatemque Carthaginensem deseratis, loca templa sacra urbemque eorum relinquatis*, and then *Romam ad me meosque ueniatis nostraque uobis loca templa sacra urbs acceptior probatiorque sit*.

By the promise of a Roman cult in compensation for the abolished cult in enemy territory, the *euocatio* is a transaction of religious law, and is to be distinguished from the magical and compelling act designated by the verb *excantare* (e.g., *excantare fruges* "to make the good crops in another's fields move into one's own fields"). Like the *deuotio*, it is a proposal of an agreement which the evocator regards as so tempting to the gods he is addressing that he cannot imagine their refusing. There is no reason to believe that this conception was not the primitive one but by the same token the likelihood arises that only those gods who were the common property—except the *cognomen*—of the Romans and their enemies, or who were identified with a Roman divinity through an early and stable interpretation or through like-sounding names, were acceptable to Rome and, in fact, were so called forth. Similarly a Vedic poet will often invite Indra, for example, to reject and leave the sacrifices of other "arya," and to accept his, but such an invitation, addressed to the gods of the non-arya, of the barbarians, is inconceivable. In the same way the Hittite ritual of *euocatio*, which L. Deubner and V. Basanoff have happily compared with the Roman ritual,² asks the gods of the besieged city to come out by three roads colored white, red, and blue: this implies a classification of the gods of the Indo-European type, with the same symbolic colors for the three functions as among the Indians and the Iranians.³ In fact, the only certain case of *euocatio* cited in the annalistic

2. Basanoff, chap. 6 ("Formules hittite et romaine").

3. Dumézil, *RIER*, pp. 45-49.

tradition is that in which Juno Regina of Veii was called forth by Camillus in 396, at the end of that long and terrible war. This *euocatio* is real enough, but a swift epic floweriness has transfigured its flow. Juno Regina had been enthroned at Rome on the Capitol for a long time when her Veian double—probably an *Uni*—answered the call and came to be installed on the Aventine. The scene has been splendidly embellished, but whether imagined or not, the details are no less revealing of the intention of the ritual and the state of mind of those who were performing it (Liv. 5.21.3–22).

After promising Apollo of Delphi a tenth part of the booty as thanks for his favorable oracles, according to the legend, the dictator addressed the goddess of the besieged: "At the same time I beseech thee, Queen Juno, that dwellest now in Veii, to come with us, when we have gotten the victory, to our City—soon to be thine, too—where a temple meet for thy majesty may there receive thee." The Veians did not yet know that they had been doomed and were "unconscious that they were already given up by their own soothsayers, and by foreign oracles, that some of the gods had already been invited to share in their despoiling, while others having been entreated to quit their city were beginning to look to new homes in the temples of their enemies, and that this was the last day they were themselves to live . . ." Once the city was taken and sacked, and its citizens, *libera corpora*, sold at public auction, Camillus paid his imperious respects to the goddess who had so completely betrayed her first worshipers (Liv. 5.22.4–7):

. . . For out of all the army youths were chosen, and made to cleanse their bodies and to put on white garments, and to them the duty was assigned of conveying Queen Juno to Rome. Reverently entering her temple, they scrupled at first to approach her with their hands, because this image was one that according to Etruscan practice none but a priest of a certain family was wont to touch; when one of them, whether divinely inspired or out of youthful jocularly, asked, "Wilt thou go, Juno, to Rome?"—whereat the others all cried out that the goddess had nodded assent. It was afterwards added to the story that she had also been heard to say that she was willing. At all events we are told that she was moved from her place with contrivances of little power, as though she accompanied them voluntarily, and was lightly and easily transferred and carried safe and sound to the Aventine, the eternal home to which the prayers of the Roman dictator had called her; and there

Camillus afterwards dedicated to her the temple which he himself had vowed.

But the honorable *euocatio* was not the only, nor even the ordinary lot of the gods of conquered cities; conquered with them, they were subject to the discretion of the conquering general and of the Roman people. The scruples mentioned by Macrobius and Servius as the origin of the *euocatio*—*quod nefas aestimarent deos habere captiuos; propter uitanda sacrilegia*—are belied by one actuality: the *sacellum Mineruae captae*, “where the Caelian Hill begins to slope down toward the plain and where the street is almost level.” Among the explanations which Ovid gives for this name, only one is acceptable, the one which preserves the ordinary meaning of *capta* (F. 3.843–44): “. . . Or is it because she came to Rome as a captive after the complete subjection of the Faliscans, as an ancient inscription tells us?” This brutal epithet proves that in 241, after the final and conclusive capture of Falerii (Liv. *per.* 20), the goddess was not treated like the Juno of Veii, but in accordance with the law of the victor.⁴ This law would constantly remain in force, and indeed it would become harsher as the Roman conquests moved farther away from nearby and familiar lands. Tertullian is shocked by it (*Nat.* 2.17): “The Romans have committed as many sacrileges as they have trophies, they have triumphed over as many gods as they have over nations: for this I need no more proof than the captive statues.” The Digest (II.7.36) offers a cold, rational explanation of the law: “When places are captured by their enemies, all things there cease to be *religiosa* or *sacra*.” Plautus (*Amph.* 258) had already described a capitulation in these terms: *deduntque se, diuina humanaque urbem et liberos*. This is echoed by Livy, in the formula which he reproduces near the beginning of his history (I.38.1–2), where he describes the surrender of the Sabines of Collatia:

. . . The king [Tarquin] asked, “Are you the legates and spokesmen sent by the People of Collatia to surrender yourselves and the People of Collatia?” “We are.” “Is the People of Collatia its own master?” “It is.” “Do you surrender yourselves and the People of Collatia, city, lands, water, boundary marks, shrines, utensils, all appurtenances, divine and human, into my power and that of the Roman People?” “We do.” “I receive the surrender.”

4. Basanoff, pp. 50–52. The *euocatio* of other Faliscan divinities in 241, notably of Juno Curitis, is only a hypothesis.

Rome and its leaders disposed freely of those *sacra* which were delivered into their hands, with no other restriction than whatever religious scruples they might feel. In a great many cases, the cults disappeared after the physical or juridical destruction of those who practiced them, whether nations or *gentes*. To these foreign cults Rome merely extended the treatment which allowed the minor *sacra priuata* to disappear along with the *gens* to which they belonged. But there was another practice which allowed the state to intervene in order to preserve either the important *sacra gentilia* which had escheated or the *sacra publica* whose celebration had been entrusted to some *gentes*; similarly victorious Rome, which could dispose without appeal of the *sacra* of the vanquished, was also able to preserve them. Arnobius (3.38) says that the Romans customarily divided the cults of the conquered towns into two parts: one was distributed, *priuatum*, among the Roman families, while the other was annexed to the *sacra publica* and sometimes entrusted to the family of the victorious general.

As Rome developed into an imperial power, it admitted more variety in acting with the conquered peoples, and there was a multiplication of the possible degrees of difference in the status of the conquered gods. Often harshness continued to be used. After the capture of Capua, which deserved severe punishment, all the statues in the spoils were turned over to the college of pontiffs for deciding which were sacred and which profane (Liv. 26.34.12); not one was left in the city. But Rome terminated other wars on terms which subdued the enemy but left him some degree of freedom; here too there were shades of difference. It was an ancient practice, says Livy (28.24.7)—in connection with a more clement treatment by Scipio in Spain—not to regard or treat a nation as pacified until it had surrendered all its divine and human belongings, given back its hostages, handed over its arms, and accepted garrisons in its cities, unless a pact of friendship had been concluded with it by treaty or through an alliance on equal terms. The *foedus* and the *leges aequae* thus kept the *sacra* in place; the *ciuitates foederatae* remained religiously independent; and as long as they were not taken into the *ciuitas Romana*, either by force or at their own desire, their gods were regarded as foreign. This was the fate of the Fortuna of Praeneste. Lutatius, the victor in the First Punic War, was forbidden by the Senate to consult her

oracles, because the state must be steered only by national, not by foreign, procedures of consulting the gods, *patriis, non alienigenis*.⁵ Once admitted to citizenship, the cults of the allies came under the jurisdiction of the pontiffs, though without being incorporated into the public Roman cult. Under Tiberius this ancient principle was used to resolve a delicate problem. During an illness of Livia, the knights had vowed an offering to *Fortuna Equestris*. Now, as Tacitus tells it (*Ann.* 3.71.1-2), although *Fortuna* had many temples in Rome, she had none at all under this *cognomentum*. But it was remembered that there was one at Antium (doubtless one of the two *Fortunae* in that city, the other being a *Fortuna Prospera*), and it was recalled that all Italic cults, temples, and statues of the gods were *iuris atque imperii Romani*; and the gift of the knights was forwarded to Antium. With the invention of the flexible formula of the *municipium*, which had so rich a future, religious status varied according to the institution. Sometimes, even in the worst cases, the magistrates retained possession of the *curatio sacrorum*, or were reduced to this *curatio* (*Liv.* 9.43.24). This at least partial conservatism was the basic policy of the pontiffs. Festus defines the *municipalia sacra* as "those which the people involved always practiced before they received the *ciuitas Romana*, and which the pontiffs wished to continue observing and practicing in the traditional forms" (pp. 273-74 L²).

In particular cases, the juridical and political shrewdness of the leaders and priests of Rome was able to figure out the most useful procedure, but very few such cases are known to us. After the putting down of the revolt of the Latins, in 338, we should like to know the fate of the *sacra* in each of the conquered towns, which, except for Velitrae, Tibur, and Praeneste, were treated rather gently. But, while Livy tells us that for each town a special provision and a special decree were made, he gives no particulars except on the political and military clauses, and on the ships of Antium which were confiscated so that their rostra might adorn the tribune of the Forum. Only the special fate of *Juno Sospita*, that is, *Seispes*, of Lanuvium is mentioned: "The Lanuvini were given citizenship, and their worship [*sacra*] was restored to them, with the stipulation that the temple and grove of *Juno Sospita* should be held in common by the burghers of Lanuvium

5. Val. Max. 1.3.2; see Dumézil, *DL*, p. 79, n. 1.

and the Roman People" (Liv. 8.14.2). This original combination, a kind of *communicatio sacrorum* in which the *municipium* remained *Junonia sedes* (Sil. It. 8.360), had interesting consequences. The prodigies which occurred in the temple were proclaimed in Rome, where the expiation was decided on. The years which Hannibal spent in Italy saw many of these prodigies, all carefully neutralized, which proved the interest taken by this goddess, annexed on the spot, in the affairs of the metropolis. In Cicero's time, his client Milo, a Roman citizen residing in Rome, was the highest magistrate of Lanuvium, still called *dictator*. On 18 January 52, at three in the afternoon, Milo had the fortune, or misfortune, to meet P. Clodius not far from Bovillae. Milo's slaves, acting without his orders or knowledge, if Cicero is to be believed, took advantage of this meeting to render the turbulent demagogue permanently incapable of doing further mischief. At the time of this encounter Milo was legally and innocently on his way to Lanuvium—*iter sollemne, legitimum, necessarium*—where he was to appoint the flamen of Juno (Cic. Mil. 27; 46). But this cult was not entirely confined to these formalities, which were performed by unimportant men. Each year, probably after they took office, the consuls had to offer a sacrifice to this Juno (Cic. Mur. 90). It is true that in this era the *honestissimum municipium* of Lanuvium gave consuls to Rome, of whom the plebeian P. Licinius Murena is an example, and that later it would produce an emperor, Antoninus Pius. *Sacerdotes Lanuvini*, chosen among the Roman *equites* and analogous to the *sacerdotes Tusculani*, are known from inscriptions (CIL, IX, 4206-8; etc.). The *modus vivendi* of 338 did not keep the Romans from wishing to possess on their own soil the object of the condominium established at a distance of six leagues from them. In 194, C. Cornelius Cethegus erected a temple to the goddess, under the Romanized epithet of Sospita, in the *Forum holitorium*. Three years earlier, in Cisalpine Gaul, during the war against the Insubres, he had vowed this temple (Liv. 32.30.10; 34.43.3), and in it the goddess was honored in her military guise. It is probably this Roman temple, and not the one at Lanuvium, which was the subject of a story that sheds light on the form of religiosity prevalent in Rome at the beginning of the first century B.C. In 90, Caecilia Metella, daughter of the conqueror of the Baleares, declared that in a dream she had had great trouble in keeping Juno Sospita from leaving her temple; infamous actions had

polluted it, matrons had used it as a place for sordid prostitutions of their bodies, and a bitch had littered at the foot of the goddess's statue (Jul. Obs. 55). And so, at the command of the Senate, the consul L. Julius Caesar restored the edifice (Cic. *Div.* 1.4). Are we to understand that the temple was by then so run-down that there occurred within its walls what normally occurs in the dark corners of great cities?

4

THE GODS OF THE MERCHANTS

Toward the end of the regal period, when an enlarged Rome was opened to an influx of a widely disparate population, a number of cults also came in. Each family arrived with its own gods, and worshiped them privately. This practice continued throughout the era of the Republic. Numismatics shows the devotion to the Dioscuri of the Fonteii, who came from Tusculum, and of the Thorii and several other Lanuvian families to the Juno of that place. Not only did the administrators of the official religion see nothing inconvenient in these loyalties, but they desired them. More than one public cult arose out of this concern: it came about that the state took a more active interest in the rites which it tolerated, and granted them, if not complete naturalization, legal recognition and a place for their practice outside of individual houses.

Unless Varro's Sabinism has retouched things, it is in this way that the Aurelii are supposed to have introduced the sun god, who is ignored by the ancient ferial. "It is thought," says Festus (p. 120 L²), "that the Aurelia family, coming from the Sabine nation, was so called after the sun, because the Roman people, at the state's expense, gave them a piece of property where they might make sacrifices to the Sun; they were called *Auseli*, from a derivative of the word for the sun"—and this indication surely comes from Varro (*L.L.* 5.68), who gives *ausel* as the Sabine word for the sun (*Sol ausel* is a very plausible emendation for the unintelligible *solauel* of the manuscripts). But this family cult does not seem to have been developed. It is probably not connected with the *puluinar Solis*, a sacred place on the Quirinal, right beside the temple of Quirinus (Varr. *L.L.* 5.52). The designation of this place as *puluinar* "cushion," and the mention of

the name of the evening star on an inscription which was read there in Quintilian's time (17.12) point rather to a Greek origin.

But it could happen that one of these family cults, having become too important and assumed a truly public interest, was not only naturalized but nationalized. Only one example of this process is known, and this exceptional quality has rendered the account of its transmission given by the historians suspect in the eyes of several critics. The meaning of the account is clear, however, if not the circumstances of its evolution. Here is how Hercules became an important god of the Roman state.¹

In the wide opening toward the Tiber of the valley of the Circus Maximus were two places attached by legend and by cult to the famous traveler of Greek fable, Hercules, one almost in the middle, in front of the Palatine (*per ima montis Palatini*, Tac. *Ann.* 12.24), the other at the very foot of the Aventine. Here was the site of the Porta Trigemina and of the Ara Maxima, the most important place for the cult of Hercules in the historical period of Rome. Each of the two places attributed its principal monument to the hero himself: the *templum Herculis Victoris*, near the Porta Trigemina, had been erected near the altar built by Hercules for Jupiter Inventor, while it was either Evander or again Hercules who had built the *Ara*, on the occasion of his victory over Cacus. Thus, before Rome even existed, Hercules had already honored its site.

"Hercules and Cacus"—these names call to mind the fine book by Michel Bréal—now out of date, but how intelligent (1863)!—written in the heroic, enthusiastic period of Indo-European studies. In reality, the legend of the rather unfriendly meeting of Hercules and Cacus was certainly not very old when Virgil reinforced it by his art. With its own variants, it is only one of the forms taken by a legend popular among the Greeks in Italy.² While Herakles was passing through the peninsula with the cattle which he had taken, somewhere in the west, from Geryon, the herdsman of the Sun, a number of imprudent men tried to rob him of them. At Crotona there was one of these men, named Lakinos or Lakinios. Herakles slew him and also,

1. The basic book is still Jean Bayet, *Les origines de l'Hercule romain* (1926). On Herakles in Magna Graecia, see M. Détienné, "Héracès, héros pythagoricien," *RHR* 158 (1960): 19-53.

2. Bayet, pp. 154-82.

inadvertently, Kroton, the brigand's son-in-law, who tried to prevent the theft. As reparation, Herakles promised that Kroton's name would be given to a powerful town (Diod. Sic. 6.24.7). At Locri, the thief was likewise the king Lakinios and the innocent victim, once more, the eponym of the town, Lokros (Conon Narr. 3). One of these stories must have been adapted on the banks of the Tiber and the role of the villain assigned to Cacus, an ancient figure about whom we know no more than what Virgil has chosen to tell. As for the name which Herakles received at Rome (*Hercles*, then *Hercoles*, then *Hercules*), it takes its place among the numerous distortions which are recorded in Italy (Etruscan *Her[a]cle*, *Hercla*, *Erkle*; central Italian *Hercle*; Oscan *Hereklos*; Sabellian *Herc[o]lo-*), but it gives no clue to its precise source.

In fact, nothing can be said about the origin of the sanctuaries of Hercules. The quarter in which they are found, the *Forum boarium*, was an active center of commerce. Surrounded by three steep hills—the Aventine on the south, the Palatine on the southeast, and the Capitol on the north—it was at the crossing of the two principal trade routes which guaranteed Rome's power: the waterway, the Tiber, by which the ships reaching land at Ostia came up to Rome, and the land route which connected central Italy with Sabine country and maritime Etruria by the Sublician bridge, Velabrum, and Subura. Partly reclaimed from swampland, this inland port must at a very early date have swarmed with one of the cosmopolitan crowds which fill all the great commercial centers. Here Hercules arrived, no doubt on several separate occasions, with his worshippers from the Italic cities.³

Until the last years of the fourth century, the cult of the Ara Maxima was a private cult, belonging to the family of the Potitii, with whom the family of the Pinarii was associated in a subordinate position—two

3. There is a Phoenician theory, until now rather implausible, which has been encouraged by the discoveries at Pyrgi (see below, pp. 680-82): D. van Berchem, "Hercule-Melqart à l'Ara Maxima," *Rendiconti della Accademia Pontificale* 32 (1959-61): 61-68; A. Piganiol, "Les origines d'Hercule," *Coll. Lat.*, 58, pt. 2 (*Hommage à A. Grenier*) (1962): 1261-64; R. Rebuffat, "Les Phéniciens à Rome," *MEFR* 78 (1966): 7-48; D. van Berchem, "Sanctuaires d'Hercule-Melqart," *Syria* 44 (1967): 307-38. (The interpretation of Potitii as "possessed [by the god]" and generally the Semitic comparisons are not convincing, but in the "Note Additionnelle," the author is probably right when recognizing a likeness of the Ara Maxima on a medallion of Antoninus, on a medallion and a coin of Caracalla: a very big table, justifying the epithet *Maxima*.)

gentes whose origin is unknown, but whom there is no reason to regard as foreign and whose existence as *gentes* is above suspicion.⁴ Legend also assigned their privilege to Hercules himself. A proof of the antiquity of the cult, not stunning but still appreciable, would be the clay state, *Hercules fictilis*, which presided over the rites in the Ara. It was attributed to the same artist, the Etruscan Volca, who had made the Capitoline Jupiter (Plin. N.H. 35.157). But a critical view would have to reserve the possibility that this venerable piece had not been made for the place which it honored with its presence: plenty of Etruscan towns, especially Veii, had been sacked and despoiled of their gods as well as their wealth. Whatever the facts of the origins of the cult, in 312 everything changed, and we should be happy to know the conditions under which this change occurred.⁵ The annalistic tradition says that the censor Appius Claudius had persuaded the Potitii to yield their *familiare sacerdotium* to the state by admitting public slaves to the rites. According to Festus, he had bought this renunciation at a stiff price, 50,000 *as*. Either the god did not care for this transaction in which he was not a participant, or he was angered by the divulgence of his secrets. Appius Claudius went blind, and within the year all the members of the selling family died (Liv. 9.29.6; Dion. 1.40.5; etc.). But the wrath of the god was confined to these two punishments; thenceforward it was the urban praetor who each year made the offering of an ox (or a heifer) at the Ara Maxima in the name of Rome.

What authentic facts are covered over by this story? Some think that the essential element, the procedure, is invented and that we must understand, by reversing the order of events, that if the state assumed control of the cult, it was because the proprietary family had died out. As we know (Cic. Leg. 2.47; cf. 2.22), the state took care that the important *sacra priuata* should not disappear along with their officiants, and in this case it is supposed to have exercised an *usucapio pro herede*. If this is so, however, it is hard to explain why such a commonplace event was so dramatically reinterpreted that the idea of a sale was introduced. Others, for instance J. Bayet, think that there was an

4. J. Carcopino, in the essay which was inspired by Bayet's book, reprinted (pp. 176-206) in *Aspects mystiques de la Rome païenne* (1941), gives a daring explanation of the names of the Potitii and Pinarii as approximations to Greek words and in the language of the mysteries: *ποτιζων* "cup-bearer," *πινωρτες* "starved [for the food of life]."

5. Bayet, pp. 263-74.

actual transfer by the family to the state, either through a *communicatio sacrorum* or, juridically, through an *in iure cessio*; but the reasons for this operation, which is after all unique, are not clear. According to the tradition, the censor took the initiative in the sale, with the family merely giving its consent. J. Bayet offers an explanation which is probable *per se*, though perhaps too strictly "economic": the cult of the Ara Maxima, entirely private as it was, was opened to the public with the institution of the tithe, which we shall have occasion to consider shortly. As the cult developed, the state felt the need to control it, and the proprietors, finding the expense heavier and heavier—the tithe was sacrificed to the god and did not enrich them—would have accepted the proposal which was made to them with relief.⁶

The yearly festival of the Ara Maxima, an altar in a *lucus*, with a *sacellum* containing the ancient statue, took place on 12 August. It can be reconstructed from Virgil's description, in the eighth book of the *Aeneid* (268–305), of Evander's sacrifice, but other data confirm its most interesting features. The ritual is said to be Greek (Serv. *Aen.* 8.276). The sacrificing official performs with his head uncovered (Macr. 3.6.17, following Varro; Serv. II *Aen.* 8.288), with a wreath of laurel picked on the Aventine (Serv. *Aen.* 8.276), and women are excluded (Macr. 1.12.28; Plut. *Q.R.* 60), as they are from several Greek cults of Herakles. But the form of the sacrifice itself is original. The rites are divided between morning and evening, the victim being sacrificed before noon and the *exta* offered at the end of the day, amid songs and hymns, after a torchlight procession (Verg. *Aen.* 8.281–305). This wide interval cannot be explained by the Roman phrase *inter exta caesa et porrecta*, which is applied in cultic context only to one circumstance, the summer Vinalia. In contrast with ordinary Roman usage (*prae-fatio* to Janus, or to Janus and Jupiter, etc.), the sacrifices offered to Hercules do not involve an invocation to any other divinity (Plut. *Q.R.* 90, following Varro). Finally, while there was a long but limitative list of foods which might be offered to all the gods, Hercules was able to eat and drink everything: *Herculi autem omnia esculenta, poculenta* (Fest. p. 358 L²). Consistently with his legend, this glut-tony was extended to the participants in the cult; according to Varro (*L.L.* 6.54), they devoured the whole animal on the spot, even the skin

6. Fest. p. 391 L² ("*sine sacris hereditas*") explains clearly how the private cults might be, in financial terms, an *incommodum* burden.

(Serv. II *Aen.* 8.183), as leather thongs were eaten in conditions of starvation.

More than the annual ceremony, however, what characterized the Ara was the duty of the tithe, which does not appear to have had a preferential time. It too had the finest legendary authority. In a variant of the story of Cacus, it was his opponent, Recaranus, who consecrated (*profanauit*) a tenth part of his livestock at the Ara Maxima, from which it came about *ut Herculi decimam profanari mos esset* (Aur. Vict. Or. 6.5-7); or else it was Hercules himself who taught the custom to Potitius and Pinarius by consecrating (still *profanasset*) a tenth of the oxen which he had taken away from Geryon and which he was driving to Argos (Fest. p. 343 L²).⁷ In any case, the tithe was well established and contributed not a little to the renown of the altar and the cult. Some picturesque examples have been preserved, which plunge us directly into the "life of the non-illustrious men" of Rome. In the second book of his *Memorabilia*, Masurius Sabinus related the following story, which is preserved in Macrobius (3.6.11).⁸ M. Octavius Herennus (Herennus?), after having been a flute-player in his early adolescence, conceived a distaste for this profession and devoted himself to a career in business. He amassed a fortune, of which he consecrated a tenth part to Hercules. Later, as he was traveling by ship on business matters, he was attacked by pirates; he put up a valiant resistance and emerged victorious from the encounter. In a dream, Hercules declared himself to be the author of his escape. Octavius then obtained from the magistrates a plot of ground on which he established a temple and gave the god, in an engraved inscription, the title of *Victor*.

The important phrase in this account is definitely *mercaturam instituit*. This young artist becomes, so to speak, the client and debtor of Hercules on the day when he repudiates his art and becomes a merchant. This was certainly the god's vocation. Introduced by Greeks who were neither philosophers nor poets, but businessmen, his virtues, his examples, his tastes, and the energetic discipline set forth in the account of his earthly career were naturally oriented toward the conditions governing the adventurous and perilous life

7. E. Benveniste, "Profanus et profanare," *Coll. Lat.* 45 (*Hommages à G. Dumézil* (1960): 46-53 (on the tithe of Hercules, pp. 50-53).

8. Latte, p. 15, n. 2; other epigraphic examples will be found there.

of his worshippers. Like Herakles, they roamed the world: one sacrifices to Hercules *propter uiam, quod est proficiscendi gratia* (Fest. p. 334 L²). Like Herakles, they followed each his own adventure, with countless episodes, marked by hard-won successes and interrupted by hazardous struggles on land and sea; Hercules is honored with the epithet of *Victor*, in which perhaps we may discern the Greek *καλλίνικος*, but which refers especially not only to the difficulties surmounted but also to the attackers repulsed; and again, with the epithet of *Inuictus*, the Indomitable. Like Herakles, they carried to the ends of the world goods which were as painfully acquired and conveyed as the cattle of Geryon. Consequently, a tenth of what they earned, saved, or accumulated was offered to Hercules.

The rest of this god's dossier came through gradual accretion. When the generals take an interest in Hercules, and similarly consecrate to him a tenth part of their spoils, this is a survival, to be sure, of the old mercantile idea—is not battle a great and enriching adventure?—but garnished with everything that a soldier rather than a merchant might find attractive in the strength and bravery, the club and the legendary tactics of the Giant-killer. Can we claim to limit the scope of an inspiration which Hellenism extends to the most diverse professional types? In fact, several of the lesser sanctuaries of Hercules which proliferated in the course of the centuries owed their existence to fortunate and cultivated generals. In 187, on his return from his campaign in Aetolia, M. Fulvius Nobilior built the joint temple of Hercules and the Muses between the Circus Flaminius and the Tiber (Cic. *Arch.* 27; Serv. II *Aen.* 1.8; Plut. *Q.R.* 59; etc.). Here statues of Hercules playing the lyre and of the nine Muses, in terra-cotta, could be admired; they were the work of Zeuxis (Plin. *N.H.* 35.66). The stepfather of Augustus, L. Marcius Philippus, (or perhaps his son) had the honor of reconstructing this temple and surrounding it with a portico which was a veritable museum of Greek painting. To Pompey the Great is due the restoration of the *templum Herculis Pompeiani*, near the Circus Maximus (Vitr. 3.2.5; cf. Plin. *N.H.* 34.57: *aedes Pompei Magni*), whose columns Vitruvius thought too widely separated, a fact which is of no importance to us, but whose title is remarkable, because it seems to make the god a kind of personal protector of the man. The temple of Hercules Victor itself, a round building which must have been reconstructed in 213

after the great fire which ravaged the entire quarter, played a role in the triumph, that exceptional ceremony which, in a kind of apotheosis, glorified the personal bravery and also the good fortune of the victorious general. The procession which moved from the Field of Mars to the Circus Maximus, then on to the Sacred Way and the Capitol, first crossed the *Forum boarium* and passed in front of the temple. The bronze statue of Hercules, one of Myron's masterpieces, was covered with magnificent vestments and placed on the threshold, so that it might share in the general enthusiasm.

During this fourth century when so many innovations were introduced, Hercules in two circumstances clearly showed his double nature, adopted by the Romans, yet still a foreigner, and probably even more of a foreigner, as J. Bayet has shown, as the knowledge of Greek matters gradually came to make clear the practices of the cosmopolitan port. On the one hand, when Rome issued its first coins in the last third of the century, Hercules, despite his Greek name, appeared on the *quadrans*. On the other hand, at the beginning of the century, the first collective lectisternium, a great moment in the development of the *graecus ritus*, associated him with Diana (Artemis), thus forming one of the three "appeased" couples reclining on three richly furnished couches (Liv. 5.13.6).

Brought to the quays of Rome by the Greek merchants, Hercules was not for them the god of commerce, but rather of the energy demanded by their calling. The pure business technician is Mercury, who remained firmly attached to the kind of activity implied in his name. It is not possible to determine where he came from. An urn from the neighborhood of Capua bears the dedication *Mirikui* (Vetter, no. 136), and in Faliscan territory a substantial number of potsherds are marked with the words *tito(i) mercui efles* (Vetter, no. 264) "the aediles"—here probably the officials of the marketplace—"to Titus Mercus," with an inexplicable masculine given name preceding the name of the god. Thus the *u* of *Mercurius* is confirmed outside of Rome, although Roman Latin knows only the consonantal stem *merx*. From this it has been concluded, perhaps somewhat hastily, that the name is not Roman, but a borrowing. In any case, the cult is ancient. According to tradition, it was born, like that of the Ceres-Liber-Libera triad, in the period immediately following the expulsion

of the Tarquins. Livy places the dedication of the *aedes Mercuri* in the Circus Maximus on the Ides of May, 495, the same year in which Tarquin the Proud died in exile at Cumae (2.21.7) and two years before the establishment of the cult of the plebeian triad (493). He notes that it was the occasion of a conflict between the plebs and the patricians. The people entrusted the rites of dedication to a centurion—an act calculated to humiliate the consuls (2.27.5–6). The circumstances of the foundation show that from then on the cult of Mercury was linked to commerce, and especially to provisioning. Prior to the plebeian insult, the Senate had decided that the consul whom the people chose to perform the dedication should also control the distribution of grain and establish the *mercatorum collegium*.

Directly or indirectly (through the Etruscan *Turms*), the Greek Hermes stands behind Mercury, and this was clearly understood by the Romans who associated Mercury, in the first collective lectisternium (399), with the sea-dwelling Neptunus-Poseidon to form one of the three beneficiary pairs. But for a long time the Hermes whom he represented was, strictly, only the patron *negotiorum omnium* (Fest. p. 251 L²). This is still how he has to introduce himself to the spectators, with the weighty vocabulary of business, in the opening lines of the *Amphitruo*, even though the *negotium* which he promotes throughout the play has nothing, or almost nothing, to do with commerce:

*Ut uos in uostris mercimoniis
emundis uendundisque me laetum lucris
adficere atque adiuuare in rebus omnibus . . .*

Even Ovid, who first invokes a Mercury who is Hermes in all general respects (F. 5.663–92), soon reduces him to his Roman dimensions in order to describe the rites of his festival on the Ides of May. “All,” he says, “who make a business of selling their wares give thee incense and beg that thou wouldst grant them gain.” On this day the merchant goes to fill an urn at the “fountain of Mercury,” near the Porta Capena. He wets a laurel branch in this water, sprinkles his wares, dampens his own hair, and “in a voice accustomed to deceive,” asks pardon of the god for past perjuries and for frauds to come: “Only grant me profits, grant me the joy of profit made, and see to it that I enjoy cheating the buyer!”

5

THE FIRST GREEK GODS

One day an old woman, a foreigner, brings to Tarquin the Proud nine books which she claims contain the divine oracles, and offers to sell them to him. The king asks the price. She sets one so exorbitant that the king believes her to be touched with the madness of old age and bursts into laughter. The woman sets before him a portable hearth in which she burns three of the nine books, and then asks the king if he wishes to buy the remaining six, at the same price. The king's hilarity redoubles. The woman burns three more books, and imperturbably offers to sell him the last three, still at the same price. Faced with such assurance, Tarquin becomes serious again; he reflects and then buys them without bargaining. The woman disappears, having delivered to Rome, through the hands of the ephemeral Etruscan king, one of the great instruments of its religious exploration. These are the *libri Sibyllini*, to which, as to an oracle, only the *quindecimvirs* have access when the state is disturbed by a prodigy.

Aulus Gellius tells us (1.19.1) that he found this story in *antiquis annalibus*. Later on we shall examine this delicate question,¹ but we must mention it here because many historians make use of the old woman in order to provide a Roman past for a god of the future, Apollo.² Since the Sibyl comes from Cumae, and since later tradition guarantees the authority of the writings in Apollo's name, it is readily concluded, despite the absence of any evidence, that there was a cult of this god in the period of the kings. It is an improper deduction. Probably composed at first from formulas of various origins, Etruscan

1. Below, pp. 601-2.

2. On Apollo, J. Gagé, *Apollon romain, essai sur le culte d'Apollon et le développement du "ritus Graecus" à Rome des origines à Auguste* (1955); on the author's opinion about the origin of the Sibylline Books, pp. 26-38 and 196-204.

as much as Latin and more than Greek, the writings which ended by being called the Sibylline Books must have maintained an independent life for a long time, sufficient to themselves and preserved in the temple of Jupiter, the regent of the world. As for archaic connections, even through Cumae, with the Apollo of the oracles, the Apollo who spoke at Delphi, they are unlikely. The consultation which Brutus and the sons of Tarquin are said to have held with the Pythian oracle is pure legend, intended solely to emphasize, by a common theme of folklore, the intelligence of the great Dullard. It is not even probable that the consultation of the Delphic god by Camillus or the promise of the tithe, shortly before the end of the war with Veii, are historical: the account of these years and the actions of this hero belong to literature, which lacked only a mature language, a poet, and an audience to anticipate the *Aeneid*. In his tenth book (8.2), Livy calls the *duumviri sacris faciundis* who were in charge of foreign cults and who had access to the Sibylline Books *antistites Apollinaris sacri*. This is nothing but an anachronism, proving no more, with respect to the origins, than the tripod and the dolphin which were later the insignia of these priests.

The only Apollo known to Rome in the fifth century is a god of healing, with no connection either in foundation or in cult with the Books. Vowed during an epidemic in 433, the temple was dedicated in 431 by the consul Cn. Julius Mento, in *pratis Flaminiis*, at the foot of the southwest slope of the Capitol. Livy says *aedes Apollini pro ualetudine populi uota est*, and adds that the duumvirs did many things *ex libris*, that is, as he thinks, at the instance of the Sibylline Books, in order to appease the gods and to ward off the plague. But the very order of his phrases rules out the possibility that he considers the vowing of the temple as also having been made *ex libris* (4.25.3; cf. 29.7). In another passage he specifies that the spot on which the temple was erected was already called *Apollinar* (manuscripts *Apollinare*, Liv. 3.63.7). There is no reason to doubt this statement, but we must not take it to mean that there was an earlier public cult of the god. There might have been a *sacellum* there, or an area in which a private cult was still practiced, such as Hercules probably had in the *Forum boarium* before he was taken over first by a Roman *gens* and later by the state. This medical aspect of Apollo was apparently the one chiefly kept by the Romans until the more positive contacts with

Greek religion and until the Second Punic War. Even in the first collective lectisternium, in 399, which combined the three couples Apollo and Latona, Diana and Hercules, and Mercury and Neptune, Apollo is probably, above all, a doctor, since the occasion for this Greek ceremony in which he was the first named, and important enough to draw with him his Greek mother and sister, was a *gravis pestilensque omnibus animalibus aestas* (Liv. 5.13.4). Moreover, to judge by the epigraphic documentation, this cult, established by the Senate perhaps on the basis of a preexisting private cult, does not seem to have achieved wide popularity until the great Punic crisis. Even then there was no important or lasting establishment, and it was only the political and religious interest which Augustus later gave to his father's god that made Apollo, for a while, one of Rome's principal protectors in observance and in literature.³

Another healer, more of a technician, who must have arrived at the beginning of the third century (293), was Asklepios—formerly Aisklapios—whose name was Latinized as *Aesc(u)lapius*. Greek practices had by then entered upon their great career. In that same year for the first time the Quirites took part in the *ludi Romani* with wreaths on their heads, and for the first time, *translato e Graecia more*, palm branches were given to the winners. When an epidemic which might have been classed as a prodigy desolated the countryside and the city, the Books were consulted; they urged that Aesculapius should be brought from Epidaurus to Rome. For lack of time, since the consuls were occupied with wars, the Romans had to be content for the moment with a day of *supplicatio*. Soon, however, the emissaries sent to Epidaurus returned with the sacred serpent, the manifestation of the god. Later it was told that he willingly embarked in Greece and landed no less spontaneously at the southern end of the *Insula Tiberina*, and that the epidemic ceased at the moment of his arrival. A temple was dedicated to him on the same spot in 291. In the style of the *Ἀσκληπιεῖα*, the sacred building was surrounded with porticoes where the sick came to make the *incubatio*, that is, to spend the night in the hope that a prescription for their cure might be revealed to them; and, as in Greece, snakes and dogs were kept by the priests

3. On Sulla and Apollo, below, pp. 538–39.

(Fest. p. 233 L²). Votive offerings of thanksgiving have been recovered from the bed of the Tiber.⁴

The divine ministry of public health, as it functioned in Epidauros—Apollo, Asklepios, and Hygieia (Paus. 2.27.6)—was completed in the following century. There was an epidemic which lasted for such a long time and tried Rome and Italy so severely that finally in 180, after a consul, a praetor, and many important persons had died, it was decided to class it among the prodigies. "C. Servilius the pontifex maximus," says Livy (40.37.2-3), "was directed to inquire into the manner of averting the wrath of the gods and the decemvirs to look into the Books; the consul was ordered to vow gifts and to give gilded statues to Apollo, Aesculapius and Salus;⁵ these he vowed and gave. The decemvirs proclaimed a two-day period of prayer for health, not only in the City but in all the rural settlements and communities; all people above the age of twelve, wearing garlands and carrying laurel branches in their hands, made the supplication." The positive spirit of the Romans was not satisfied with these measures. At least one woman who was a poisoner, or who was reputed to be such, was suspected, convicted, and executed: she was the widow of the deceased consul, a kind of early Agrippina, who was said to have done away with her husband so as to assure her son by a former marriage of the consulate (ibid. 5-7). It is interesting to see the Senate thus enlisting simultaneously the four independent and complementary procedures of the *pontifex maximus*, the decemvirs, the consul, and the praetor.

About forty years after Aesculapius, the Books introduced a very impressive couple to Rome. In 249, at a difficult stage of the First Punic War and after a series of threatening portents, the decemvirs once more had to consult the oracular books. There they read, as it was later told, that it was necessary to celebrate the *ludi Tarentini* (or *Terentini*) on the Field of Mars, for three consecutive nights, in honor of Dis and Proserpina; to sacrifice black victims to them; and finally to make a promise to repeat the ceremony after a *saeculum* of one hundred years (Varro, in Censor. 17.8).⁶ The final clause was to be

4. M. Besnier, *L'île Tibérine dans l'Antiquité* (1902); on Aesculapius, pp. 135-248.

5. In the inscriptions, this Salus often keeps her Greek name, *Hygia*, *Hygeia*. *CIL*, X, 1546, 1571; XI, 2092; etc.

6. An entirely different account in Val. Max. 2.4.5.

a fruitful one: separated from the two divinities of the underworld, this sort of *græcus ritus* produced the Secular Games,⁷ the sequence of which is known to us with a chronology adjusted under Augustus with the purpose of justifying the year that he had chosen for "his" games.⁸ *Dis*, the Rich One, is an exact translation of *Πλούτων*, and the name *Proserpina* is a distortion of *Περσεφόνη*, through popular etymology or more probably through an Etruscan pronunciation. Until this time, as we have seen, the Roman representation of the Other World had remained in a state of confusion, and the *Di Manes* had nothing to do with a king or a queen.⁹ The two new recruits thus brought a fresh conception, but one which does not seem to have made a deep impression on the beliefs of the mass of the Romans. On this point as on so many others, the brilliant Hellenizing literature of the final centuries creates an illusion. In the northern part of the Field of Mars, apparently, on a spot named Tarentum (or Terentum?) (Fest. p. 420 L²; Serv. *Aen.* 8.63), the king of the nether regions and his pathetic bride received an underground altar, to which there was admittance only on the rare occasion of their festival. But the specific and after all comforting representations which were attached to their names must at that time have begun to attract more than one unsatisfied soul.

7. On the *Tarentum*, P. Boyancé, "Note sur le Tarentum," *MEFR* 42 (1925): 135-46; J. Gagé, *Recherches sur les Jeux Séculaires* (1934), chap. 1 ("Le site du Tarentum"), pp. 7-23; Latte, p. 246, n. 6. An onomastic connection with the city of Tarentum remains likely, on which see P. Wuilleumier, *Tarente des origines à la conquête romaine* (1939).

8. We shall not take up here the difficult question of the earliest Secular Games; see H. Wagenvoort, "The Origin of the *ludi saeculares*" (1951), reprinted in *Studies in Roman Literature, Culture and Religion* (1956), pp. 193-232. I call attention in passing to a part of the suggestive article by R. Merkelbach, "Aeneas in Cumae," *MH* 18 (1961): 83-99 ("Die Sibylle und die *ludi saeculares*").

9. Above, pp. 363-69.

6

AN ATTEMPT AT CHRONOLOGY

The clearly delimited and thoroughly controlled Aesculapius, Dis, and Proserpina are only an advance guard, and the circumstances of their adoption suggests more remarkable enrichments to come. It is now time to return to chronological considerations. From the end of the regal period to the eve of Rome's spectacular rise to greatness, we have observed and classified by type the multiple means by which the ancient theology was amplified without being distorted. Now we must specify as accurately as possible, in broad terms and with statistical methods, how these processes were distributed in time; and more generally, how Rome behaved toward the foreign gods and the foreign ways of worship during these little-known centuries.

The oldest political and religious connections between Rome and her immediate neighbors cannot be determined.¹ It is believed that particular ties with Tusculum, with Lavinium, Tibur, and a few other Latin cities can be discerned, which allowed Rome to borrow

1. A Alföldi, *Early Rome and the Latins* (1964), Jerome Lectures, 7th ser., sums up clearly the personal views of the author. P. Catalano presents very different views in his SSR. Alföldi, p. 18, n. 2, has clearly stated some of the fundamental divergences between his method and results and mine. The gap is indeed much broader. What I mean by the "tripartite ideology" of the Indo-Europeans has nothing in common with what he calls their "tripartite social system," and my work is without any connection with the views he enunciated in the *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 50 (1936) (on the Bear Cult and matriarchal form of organization in Eurasia). At the very end of the note (p. 18), he writes: "Jupiter Mars Quirinus represent, in my opinion at least, the supreme god with the two divine protectors of a bipartite system, or in other words: Jupiter presiding over both the Palatine and the Quirinal communities." The reader has found above, pp. 60-78 (notably 76-78) and 148-49, and generally in the first part of this book, my reasons for rejecting this doctrine, with all the consequences Alföldi drew from it in his attempt to reconstruct early Rome's history, mentality, and religion.

from these cities cults which were straightway regarded as national and installed inside the *pomerium*. Several reorganizations of Latium under successive hegemonies can also be dimly seen; of these the most notable trace, not counting certain aspects of the cult of Diana, is the cult of Jupiter *Latiaris*, for which Rome assumed responsibility after becoming the mistress of Latium. Even from the Etruscan period, the religious contribution and the heritage which it left are hard to measure and, consequently, easy to exaggerate. The calendar is of Etruscan origin, but in the earliest form that is known to us it is no longer a royal calendar. The *rex sacrorum* appears here and there in it, in minor references (*Q[quando] R[ex] C[omitauit] F[as]*; *regifugium*; etc.); thus it was introduced, or at least modified, after the expulsion of the Etruscan kings. Moreover, its content and the festivals which ornament it are in a very large majority strictly Latin. One might think that the *Etrusca disciplina*, a body of fixed techniques of sacred inquiry and action, would have survived the expulsion of the foreigners, but here too it takes a long time before divination from the entrails of victims becomes a regular practice of the state, and the augural art proper, with its thoroughly Roman name, was always clearly distinguished from haruspicy. The Capitoline triad is the product of an Etruscan inspiration and vow, but as we have seen, when one tries to evaluate this share of influence, one falls into hypotheses among which it is hard to choose, and some of which are already seeking influences coming, by way of Etruria, from Greece.²

In brief, one of the principal services rendered by "the Tarquins" to Rome was to open it fully to more remote influences, especially from Greece, and to give it the model for its *interpretationes*. Turan-Aphrodite, Uni-Hera, Tinia-Zeus, etc., prepared the minds of the Romans for the search for equivalences which were gradually extended to the whole pantheon, and by means of which the prestigious Greek mythology was substituted for the old Latin fables. Correlatively, the introduction to Rome of the first statues and the construction of the first temples by Etruscan artists, who had themselves been taught by the Greeks, began to humanize the Roman gods and to give them, beyond the formalism of the cult, a body and a soul.

2. R. Conway, *The Etruscan Influence on Roman Religion* (1931).

If it is not possible to determine the debt to Greek ideas of the plebeian Ceres-Liber-Libera triad,³ formed and as it were arrayed against the Capitoline triad, and if the Sibylline Books appear to be an anachronism in the account of the foundation of the triple cult, it is still probable that at least the framework, the association of three agrarian divinities, two female and one male, came from Magna Graecia; moreover, there was a tradition that Greek artists, Damophilos and Gorgasos, had worked on the decoration of the temple. If the origin of the cult of Hercules on the banks of the Tiber cannot be cleared up, it is certainly very old and must date back to the years of commercial prosperity before the Republic. In default of a stable empire, the Etruscan hegemony had guaranteed navigation and the traffic of the land routes, and had put Rome in communication with the wide world.

The history of the next two centuries, characterized by struggles against Rome's nearest neighbors, then against other circles, laboriously widened, of new neighbors, marks a long halt in this peaceful invasion by the Greek gods. Whether by *euocatio*, by capture, or by assimilation, it is the divinities of Latium or Etruria whom Rome is concerned to acquire.⁴ Of Greek influence in the fifth century almost the only trace is the establishment of the temple of Apollo in 431, after the plague of 433; but even this physician-god was not a new-comer: as we have seen, an earlier Apollinar(e) makes him a contemporary in Rome of the master of the Ara Maxima. Even at the beginning of the fourth century, the first multiple lectisternium brings together in pairs divinities who are Greek or marked with a Greek stamp, but the rite itself comes from the north and not from Magna Graecia—precisely, it seems, from the Etruscan town of Caere—and the *ludi scaenici* instituted in 363 are not Greek, but Etruscan.⁵

Must one of the strangest festivals of Rome be assigned to these obscure centuries, or even farther back, to the times of the kings? Besides a procession on 17 March, about which we know nothing,

3. Above, p. 379.

4. Principally Juno S.M.R. from Lanuvium, Curitis from Falerii, and Regina from Veii; Venus; and varieties of Fortuna.

5. F. Altheim assigns an extremely early date to Greek influence, *Griechische Götter im alten Rom*, RVV 22, 1 (1930); W. Hoffmann gives good reasons for lowering this date, *Rom und die griechische Welt im 4. Jahrhundert*, Philol., Supplement 27, 1 (1934).

whose stages were the chapels scattered throughout the four regions named after Servius Tullius, which the authors call indifferently *sacella Argeorum*, *Argea*, and even *Argei*,⁶ this name, obviously that of the "Argives," the Greeks, was applied to a macabre ceremony on 14 May. At that time it designated effigies of men, bound hand and foot, which the pontiffs and the magistrates carried solemnly to the *pons Sublicius*, where the Vestals threw them into the Tiber.⁷ The *flaminica Dialis* took part in the rites dressed in mourning. The meaning and the origin of this practice, in which the highest state officials participated, both laymen and priests, were no longer known to the scholars who have told us about them, but it is probable that a purification is involved, with scapegoats each representing a district of Rome. Were the effigies substitutes for human victims, as some ancients, before Wissowa, thought? Or had the rite always been restricted to a simulacrum (W. Warde Fowler, Latte)? There is nothing which allows us to decide, even though the second hypothesis seems more probable. But it is remarkable that the dolls thrown into the Tiber should have received the name of the Argives.

We can only compare this ceremony with the unfortunately positive cases of ritual murder, if not of human sacrifice, which are attested in historical times.⁸ The victims were generally paired couples, two men and two women, who were buried alive in the *Forum boarium*. Probably in 228 (Cichorius), the Insubres, allied with other Gallic peoples, threatened Italy. There was great consternation. Plutarch (*Marc.* 3.4) thinks this was the first time that this barbarous procedure was resorted to. Following the recommendation of the Books, the Romans executed not only a Gallic man and woman but also a Greek man and woman. The biographer of Marcellus adds, "Even to this day, in the month of November, they offer secret sacrifices, which nobody sees, to these Greeks and Gauls." We can understand the Gauls, the enemy of the moment, but why the Greeks? No convincing explanation has been offered.⁹ Is it possible that this

6. On the location of these *sacella*, see Platner, *TD*, pp. 51-53.

7. Latte, *Anhang III*, "die Argeerfrage," pp. 412-14. Cf. L. Clerici, "Die Argei," *Hermes* 77 (1942): 89-100.

8. F. Schwenn, *Die Menschenopfer bei den Griechen und Römern*, *RVV* 15, 3 (1915): 148-52;

C. Cichorius, "Staatliche Menschenopfer," *Römische Studien*, 1922, pp. 7-21.

9. According to the best explanation, the rite was Etruscan, and the Etruscans sacrificed representatives of their enemies on the north (the Cisalpine Gauls) and on the south (the Campanian Greeks), Latte, pp. 256-57.

was not a first occurrence, as Plutarch claims, but the revival of an ancient practice fallen into disuse, in which the "Argives" were the appointed victims? The same sacrifice was repeated after Cannae, in 216, *ex fatalibus libris*, with the same assortment of Gallic and Greek victims (Liv. 22.57.4: *minime Romano sacro*). At this time Rome's Greek allies in Italy and Sicily were still loyal, and if the choice had not been dictated by tradition, one might have expected possibly Gallic, in any case Spanish or African victims. This second sacrifice involved the expiation of a crime which passed as a prodigy: the unchastity of several Vestals, who had to be condemned to death. Despite a variation in the names of the Vestals, it is probably this quadruple murder in 216, rather than a more recent performance,¹⁰ to which the eighty-third *Roman Question* refers. Plutarch says, "Since the case seemed to be an atrocious one, the priests were ordered to consult the Sibylline Books. There they read the oracles which predicted these crimes and the misfortunes which would ensue unless, in order to forestall them, two Greeks and two Gauls were buried alive as a sacrifice to certain strange and foreign spirits." We should like to know the name of these spirits, but probably they are a hypothesis of the learned Plutarch. Livy, who gives a more moderate version of the event, does not present it as a sacrifice.

The fall of Veii and the glorious period following the Gallic invasion widen Rome's field of action. Now begins her Italic career and more importantly, her awareness of this calling and the great system of political organization by which she realizes it. From 343 to 283 the Samnite wars take her deep into Greek territory, to Cumae, to Capua, to Naples, now as protectress, now as conqueror. After many confused vicissitudes Italian unity is achieved, with a solidity which neither a rebellious Tarentum, nor Pyrrhus, nor Hannibal will be able to cause lasting damage. Now, and forever after, Rome is open to the Greek gods. Perhaps one of the first manifestations is the nationalization of Hercules at the Ara Maxima in 312. Henceforth a magistrate, the urban praetor, will celebrate his cult *graeco ritu*. To be sure, the numerous gods to whom the generals vow temples during the last Samnite wars are strictly Roman, to the point that

10. Cichorius, pp. 7-12, followed by Latte, p. 256, n. 4, and 284, thought that the reference was to a late ritual murder, in 114-113, but his arguments are fragile.

one has the impression of a revival of the earliest religion. For example, Quirinus (293) receives his honors soon after Jupiter (295).¹¹ At the same time (293), however, in the games which are celebrated *ob res bello bene gestas*, the citizens who take part are *coronati*, and palm branches are given to the winners. In the same year, after an epidemic has ravaged the city and the countryside, it is Aesculapius, the Asklepios of Epidaurus, whom the Sibylline Books order to be brought to Rome. For the first time Rome appeals to Greece proper, rather than to the Greek colonies in Italy.

This receptivity to outside cults was favored by an important development in the sacerdotal structure. The centuries during which Rome conquered Italy also saw, within her own walls, the successful struggle for equality of the plebs, the accession of plebeians to the consulship (367), to the curule aedileship (364), to the censorship (351), and to the praetorship (337). There remained still the most closely guarded domain, that of religion. Until the end of the fourth century, the administration of the national religion belonged exclusively to the patricians. They alone were regarded as fit for membership in the great colleges of the pontiffs and the augurs, while half of the *duumviri*, later the *decemviri sacris faciundis*, who were in charge of foreign cults, had been plebeians since 367. In the year 300 the plebs achieved its final success, admittance into the colleges of the pontiffs and augurs. Why should the plebeians not have brought along into these lofty functions their traditional and, as it were, natural prejudice in favor of the foreign gods and cults?

As we have seen, various indications suggest that the vulgar version of the story of Rome's origins was formed at this time, between 380 and 270, on the basis of legends which were sometimes considerably older than Rome itself. Having achieved great power, Rome was providing herself with a past. In the details of this scholarly work, throughout the accounts relating to Romulus, Numa, and Tarquin, Greek elements are manifest. Above all, in this past which was to obtain for their city a title of nobility consistent with her splendid present, the pre-annalists were led to assign importance to stories which were already in existence, at least in part, and which allowed the origin of the Roman people to be connected with the great

11. A list of the temples of this era, Wiss., pp. 594-95; Latte, pp. 415-16.

Greek fables. In the footsteps of Hercules they found the Arcadian Evander; Aeneas came to them from Ilion. If the first of these, with whom Latin literature will be concerned,¹² had no influence on the course of religion, this is not true of the second. Not only did the tale of Troy, through its development of Venus, bring to Rome a divine figure destined to have a brilliant future, but through the role which it traditionally assigned to Zeus and Hera in the career of the hero-founder, it helped to rejuvenate the very heart of the old theology. The events of the second half of the third century would be quick to reinforce these speculations.

For many more years to come discussions will continue concerning the origin of the Italic and, later, Roman career of the pious Aeneas.¹³ A recent suggestion, more probable than some others, assigns to the Phocians the honor of bringing Aeneas to Italy. The Etruscans seem to have been the first to welcome him. In any case, a group of statues, dating at the latest from the first half of the fifth century and discovered at Veii twenty-five years ago, in the *stipes uotivae* of the shrine of "Apollo" and in the Campetti, show Aeneas carrying his father Anchises on his shoulders. Although they do not guarantee that at this time Aeneas was an Italic hero (which in the old Greek tradition he was not), they at least bear witness that he was already popular in Etruscan Italy and that he was ready to be naturalized. In a parallel development, we are sure that the earliest "Venus" transferred to the Latins by the Etruscans was indeed the mother of the demigod who was destined to become, after Romulus, the figure primarily responsible for Roman greatness. Outside of Rome, two old sanctuaries were associated with the Trojan Aphrodite. For the shrine at Lavinium, where the cult was a federal one, our only source

12. J. Bayet, "Les origines de l'arcadisme romain," *MEFR* 38 (1920): 63-143.

13. A good restatement of the views of F. Bömer, *Rom und Troia, Untersuchungen zur Frühgeschichte Roms* (1951), by P. Boyancé, *REA* 54 (1952): 109-11. In a fine book, *Les origines de la légende troyenne de Rome* (281-31) (1942), J. Perret had argued that this legend was not formed until the time of the war with Pyrrhus; this is certainly bringing the date down too far. Besides the statues from Veii, there are portrayals on vases and an intaglio in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris representing Aeneas and Anchises which date at least from the fifth century: G. Q. Giglioli, "Osservazioni e monumenti relativi alla legenda delle origini di Roma," *Bullettino del Museo dell' impero Romano* 12 (1941): 8-12. A. Alföldi, *Die trojanischen Urahnen der Römer* (1957), has shown that the Trojan legend was important in Etruria at a very early date, as well as at Rome. On the treatment of the legend by Naevius and Virgil, see V. Buchheit, *Virgil über die Sendung Roms* (1963), esp. pp. 151-72 ("Dardanus der Römer").

until recent years was Strabo (5.3.5),¹⁴ but a cippus has just been discovered in the vicinity of the site, bearing the inscription *Lare Aineia dono*, which may date from the end of the fourth century.¹⁵

Thus the legend was already so firmly established at this place in Latium that not only the "Trojan Penates" snatched from the flames by the pious Aeneas could be localized here, but the hero could even lend his name to the ordinarily anonymous protector of the spot. However, we do not know what the hero's goddess-mother was called in this sanctuary. By contrast, we do know that at Ardea she was called *Frutis*, a name in which many authors see an Etruscan alteration of the name Aphrodite; and it was said that her cult here had been founded by Aeneas directly upon his arrival in Latium, *Veneri Matri, quae Frutis dicitur* (Solin. 2.14).¹⁶ What echoes do these Latin foundations and their legendary context awaken at Rome? In the cult, for a long time, very few. If there is something of the Greek Aphrodite, there is nothing Trojan, so far as we know, in the *Venus Obsequens*, that is, "propitious, granting prayers," to whom, in 295 the aedile Q. Fabius Gurges raised a temple with money from fines imposed on a number of matrons found guilty of unchastity (Liv. 10.31.9). Nevertheless, it is unlikely that either the Greeks or the Latins who were busy at this time adjusting the picture of the origins of Rome would have missed the chance of providing the Romans with a divine mother by making them "Aeneades," descendants of Aeneas.¹⁷

Finally, though we do not have many specific facts regarding the extension of the Greek language, if not culture, to Rome, we can be

14. R. Schilling, *La religion romaine de Venus* (1954), pp. 67-75.

15. M. Guarducci, "Cippo latino arcaico con dedica ad Enea," *Bullettino del Museo della civiltà Romana* 19 (1956): 3-13; S. Weinstock, "Two Archaic Inscriptions from Latium, 2" *JRS* 50 (1960): 114-18.

16. Schilling, pp. 75-83. It is tempting to imagine a progression from Etruria to Ardea and hence to Lavinium and to think that it was by Lavinium, which was closely associated with her through several cults, that Rome was informed of the opportunity to "create" Venus, or even that this operation was performed at Lavinium. "It is in this Latin city," writes Schilling (p. 84), "open to Etruscan influences through its immediate proximity to Ardea, and open to Sicilian influences through its maritime relations, that the metamorphosis which made a goddess of the neuter *uenus* must have been accomplished. A mysterious metamorphosis, to the extent that the silence of history leaves in shadows the precise circumstances of this accomplishment." The *Venus Calua* (above, p. 422) has no connection with the Trojan legend.

17. On Venus in the Trojan legend in Rome, see now A. Wlosok, *Die Göttin Venus in Vergil's Aeneis* (1967).

sure that it had penetrated far and into high places. In 280, before being requested to leave Rome, Cineas was able to address the Senate; he spoke in Greek, and if the aged Appius had not intervened, his Greek might perhaps have convinced that "assembly of kings."

The wars against Pyrrhus in Italy and Sicily, and later the Sicilian war against the Carthaginians, opened the field still more widely to Greek influence. The Romans, both officers and soldiers, as well as all those Romanized Italians who were by now included under that name, were constant witnesses of the religious life in those cities which they entered as allies. When the cities deserted to the enemy, great quantities of cultic statues were sent back to Rome as spoils, habituating the young soldiers to picture the gods and goddesses in more majestic and more beautiful forms than the terra-cotta figures inherited from the Etruscan period. We have already seen how in 249 the Tarentine games brought sophisticated ceremonies to Rome itself. In addition, the Sicilian campaign suddenly revealed the practical relevance of the Trojan legend.¹⁸ In 263, the second year of the Carthaginian war, the Elymi of Sicily, who regarded themselves as the descendants of Trojan emigrants, rallied to the Romans, probably under the impression that the "Aeneades" of Rome were their relatives.¹⁹ After massacring its Carthaginian garrison, their capital city, Segesta, appealed to the Romans for help (Diod. 23.5). Fifteen years later the consul L. Junius took the Elymian sanctuary at Eryx by surprise; this was one of the important centers of the cult of Aphrodite, and the Romans held out there fiercely until the end of the war, protecting a goddess in whom, from this time on, they recognized Venus, the mother of their ancestor Aeneas.

In the same era, and perhaps this is the most important factor, Latin poetry was producing its first great works. Whether in imitation or in reaction, these works were modeled on the Greek. What little

18. Schilling, pp. 234-42. It is very probable, despite arguments, that the Trojan legend of the Elymi was formed about this time; contra: Perret, pp. 300-301 and, less assertively 453-58.

19. R. van Compernelle, "Ségeste et l'hellénisme," *Phoibos* 5 (1950-51): 183-228 (up to the entry of Segesta into the alliance with Rome) shows well the great complexity of the facts. An Anatolian (Hittite) origin of the language of the Elymi is defended by R. Ambrosini, "Italica o anatolica la lingua dei graffiti di Segesta?" *Studi e saggi linguistici* 8 (1968): 160-72. On the past of the goddess of the Eryx, A. M. Bisi, "La religione punica in Sicilia alla luce delle nuove scoperte archeologiche," *SMSR* 39 (1968): 36-39, 57, with bibliography.

survives of them shows that the principal *interpretationes* were already firmly established, by means of which Greek mythology was taking over the Roman theology.²⁰ Livius Andronicus, who revealed three literary genres to Rome, epic, tragedy, and the ode, was a Greek. Captured in the overthrow of Tarentum (272) and given the task of bringing up the children of his master, Livius Salinator, he discharged this duty so well that the father enfranchised him and gave him his name. According to one tradition, the former slave opened a school, and in order to provide his pupils with a textbook, he translated the *Odyssey* into Latin. Clumsy and heavy, written in Saturnian verses, this version was still being used in the schools in Horace's time. The scraps of mythology to be found in the few preserved fragments show that by then the metamorphosis of the Roman gods was very near to being achieved, at least in literature. Jupiter-Zeus and Juno-Hera are the children of Saturn-Kronos:

pater noster, Saturni filia
 . . .
sancta puer Saturni . . . regina

Hermes and Apollo are presented:

. . . Mercurius cumque eo filius Latonas.

Poseidon has already taken over Neptune:

. . . aruaque Neptuni et mare magnum.

And in the very first line, the muse is invoked:

uirum mihi, Camena, insece uersutum.

Somewhat younger than Livius, a Campanian by birth, Cn. Naevius was probably not a citizen but a member of a Latin colony. In his tragedies, his comedies, and his epic poetry, he acts as a Roman and intends to endow Rome with a national literature.²¹ But how could he have rebelled against the Greek masters? The mythology of the *Bellum Poenicum* is that of the *Odisia*:

prima incedit Cereris Proserpina puer . . .
 . . .

20. Niebergall, *Griechische Religion und Mythologie in der älteren Literatur der Römer*, Diss. Giessen (1937).

21. M. Barchiesi, *Nevio epico: storia, interpretazione, edizione critica dei frammenti del primo epos latino* (1962).

*deinde pollens sagittis, inclutus arquitenens
sanctus Ioue prognatus, Putius Apollo.*

...

... *summi*

*deum regis fratrem, Neptunum regnatorem
marum...*

Even better: the whole beginning of the poem was devoted to the origins of Carthage and those of Rome, and was presented in Trojan terms, thus perhaps already involving the character of Dido in the legend of Aeneas.²² Virgil does not scorn to imitate the older poet (Macr. 6.2.31) when, at the beginning of the *Aeneid*, he shows Venus calling Jupiter to account over the storm which is wrecking the Trojan ships, and Jupiter comforting his daughter with the promise of the future greatness of Rome. In the first book of the *Bellum Poenicum* she was already questioning the god, who is qualified as he is in the Capitol:

patrem suum supremum optimum appellat.

And she was interrogating him sharply about the destiny of his "genus":

Summe deum regnator, quianam genus ursisti?

We cannot insist too strongly on this fact: before Ennius, before the Scipios and their circle, the men of letters had almost completed the great dictionary of equivalences. To be sure, the cult was scarcely touched, but, thanks to them, cultured Romans could now make the fruitful confusions and the generous transferences which were to give Roman religion its classic form.

22. L. Strzelecki, *De Naeuiano belli Punici carmine quaestiones selectae* (1935), thought that in this poem the Trojan legend of the origins of Rome might have been placed at the moment when the Romans and the Segestans realized that they were related. C. Koch, *Religio* (1960), p. 80 and n. 139, 140.

7

RELIGION DURING THE SECOND PUNIC WAR

Thanks to Livy's third decade and to the biographies of several great men, we can follow in some detail the ideological and cultic functioning of this religion during the dramatic years in which it may be said that it sustained and saved Rome. It is certain that legends—"pretty legends"—and amplifications have sometimes altered actual events. In several passages Livy remarks that superstition, when it is aroused, multiplies its objects; but it is notable that for none of the religious elements in his account does he draw up a table of discrepancies or contradictions in his sources as he honestly and obligingly does for political or military events.¹ This is because official notice had been taken of the cultic actions. If, under the impact of the initial turmoil, there was a certain degree of confusion in the vows and their fulfillments, everything was quickly regularized, and the accounts of gods and men were put in order. In 212, even before Capua and Syracuse had been recaptured, the comitia created a commission of triumvirs and charged them with making an inventory of sacred objects and recording gifts made to the gods, *sacris conquirendis et donis persignandis* (Liv. 25.7.5).

To characterize in broad strokes the religious life of these eventful years, punctuated by the names of Ticinus, Trebia, Trasimene, and Cannae, the following proposals may be set forth. The Romans are convinced that events are determined not by a long-range *fatum*, but rather by the momentary wrath or goodwill of the gods. As a result, everything is interpreted, everything takes on meaning, and hope springs even from disaster. Each year, each season receives its large

1. H. Dessau, "Über die Quellen unseres Wissens vom zweiten punischen Kriege," *Hermes* 51 (1916): 355-95.

quota of real or imagined prodigies, not only in the *ager Romanus*, but, as befits a dominant Rome, in the Latin, Etruscan, and Sabine towns, and even in the remote provinces. Sacred science and jurisprudence are constantly occupied in sponging away, so to speak, this flood of the supernatural. Everything is mobilized in the service of Rome: the traditional and in some ways automatic procedures of expiation and prayer (such as the sacrifice on the ninth day² after a shower of stones), but also, more and more, the Sibylline Books, which take on their definitive form in the middle of this Hellenizing century; and, when victory is in sight, the first authentic consultation of the oracle at Delphi by a Roman magistrate. Similarly all the gods are called on to save Rome. When the series of defeats proves clearly that they are not satisfied, sacred science moves from season to season, making successive adjustments and exploring the various areas of the divine, the various gods and groups of gods, in an attempt to localize the sensitive spots. There is something pathetic in this methodical, experimental observation of the illusory. At last, through these very gropings, Rome achieved the establishment of the grand outlines of the new theology, of the syncretistic pantheon, which now faces the crucial test for the first time. Very often it is the Greek god, or a mixed god, who is worshiped under a Roman name. Combinations of gods are made which are meaningless unless they are translated into Greek contexts. Above all, two old divinities, brought together in their *interpretatio graeca* by the grand ideas of the legend of Aeneas, will henceforth attract the attention of the Romans; they are Juno and Venus.

When we speak of the "crisis" of the Second Punic War, we must make clear that the crisis, a major one indeed, is of a military and political order. The mortal danger of the initial defeats is followed in swift succession by the questions raised and the choices demanded by victory. The "decadence" of the following century, in Montesquieu's terms, proves quite clearly that not all the questions were answered and not all the choices were wise. But from the religious standpoint there is no crisis in the years between Saguntum and Zama. A well-constructed organism, firm and flexible, Roman religion functions smoothly, without being worn out by the accelerated

2. *Nouendiale*; rather than "continued for nine days." Cf. Liv. 1.31.4: *mansit certe sollemne ut quandoque idem prodigium nuntiaretur feriae per nouem dies agerentur.*

pace of events. Its two tasks are those of preservation and adaptation, for which it has equipped itself beforehand; as the years pass, the second of these tasks, at first a mere accessory, almost becomes its primary concern. This is truly the right time to observe this organism in action. Before long it too will change, will even disintegrate, and the historians, who are aware of the sequel, can discover the first symptoms of corruption as early as the period of Trasimene. But, in the decisive moment, it rendered all the services that a people can expect from their national religion.

The opening stages of the war are solemn, but show no originality. With scrupulous care Rome makes sure that it is fighting a righteous war, *bellum iustum*. When Hannibal's misdeeds at Saguntum³ become flagrant, and when the Punic senate, dominated by the Barca faction, grants him its full accord, even then the Roman Senate sends a new and particularly venerable deputation, *legatos maiores natu*, to ask the Carthaginians if they sanction the distant actions of Hamilcar's son, and, if they do sanction them, to declare war. This they do *ut omnia iusta ante bellum fierent* (Liv. 21.18.1). There is nothing other than normal in the possibly *ex post facto* omen taken after the first engagement, in Transalpine Gaul. While Hannibal was bringing his elephants across, the Romans barely managed to defeat a detachment of Numidian cavalry, losing almost as many men as their opponents. From this it was concluded that the outcome of the war would be favorable, but only after many uncertainties and great trials (29.4). All this is part of sacred routine, whether active or interpretative, in any war. But soon the disaster of the Trebia, unexpected despite several annoying prodigies which befell the Roman camp and were duly *procurata* by the general, lays Etruria open to the invader, and Livy gives the first of the great religious bulletins of the campaign (62.1-5):

In Rome or near it many prodigies occurred that winter, or—as often happens when men's thoughts are once turned upon religion [*motis semel in religionem animis*—many were reported and too easily credited. Some of these portents were: that a free-born infant of six months had cried "Triumph!" in the provision market [*Forum holitorium*]; that in the cattle market

3. See above, p. 274, n. 3.

[*Forum boarium*] an ox had climbed, of its own accord, to the third storey of a house and then, alarmed by the outcry of the occupants, had thrown itself down; that phantom ships had been seen gleaming in the sky; that the temple of Hope, in the provision market, had been struck by lightning; that in Lanuvium a slain victim had stirred, and a raven had flown down into Juno's temple and alighted on her very couch [*puluinar*]; that in the district of Amitemum, in many places, apparitions of men in shining raiment had appeared in the distance, but had not drawn near to anyone; that in the Picentian country there had been a shower of pebbles; that at Caere the lots [divination tablets] had shrunk; that in Gaul a wolf had snatched a sentry's sword from its scabbard and run off with it.

If some of these prodigies—the last ones—lend themselves to direct interpretation, indicating clearly that a threat or a risk was connected with the circumstances, it is obvious that many others are no more than monstrosities, bearing witness to the wrath of the gods through the disturbance of nature. Even the triumphal cry in the *Forum holitorium* is not an omen, nor can it inspire confidence, since it is uttered contrary to the laws which regulate the ages of man. Here now is the defense raised by the state against the aggressive actions of nature (62.6–11):

For the other prodigies the decemvirs were commanded to consult the Books, but for the shower of pebbles in the Picenum a sacrifice on the ninth day was proclaimed. They then set about the expiation of the other portents, and in this virtually all the citizens bore a part. First of all, the city was purified, and major victims [*hostiae maiores*] were offered up to the designated gods; a gift of gold weighing forty pounds was carried to Lanuvium for Juno, and a bronze statue was dedicated to Juno, by the matrons, on the Aventine; a *lectisternium* was ordered at Caere, where the lots had shrunk; and a supplication was ordered to be made to Fortuna on Mount Algidus; in Rome, too, a *lectisternium* was specially appointed for Juventas, and a supplication at the temple of Hercules, and later the entire people was commanded to observe this rite at all the *pulvinaria*; also five major victims were slain in honour of the Genius of the Roman People; and C. Atilius Serranus the praetor was ordered to make a vow, "if the commonwealth should abide for ten years in its present state." The making of these vows and expiations, as prescribed by the Sibylline Books, went far to alleviate men's anxiety concerning their relations with the gods.

Several of these performances, as at Caere and Lanuvium, were imposed directly by the local prodigy. The same was true of the

lustratio urbis: since so many disturbing portents had occurred there, the city must have been defiled. The divinities mentioned by name are more remarkable: besides Juno, who was served not only at Lanuvium but also in her temple on the Aventine, they are Fortuna, Juventas, Hercules, and the Genius of Rome. The first of these is self-explanatory; the second traditionally patronized the *iuvenes* and guaranteed the permanence of Rome. However, she must have been enriched by the qualities of the Greek Hebe, the wife of Herakles, since here she is involved with a Hercules who is surely no longer the god of the merchants on the banks of the Tiber, but the Greco-Latin hero and avenger of justice, the conqueror of monsters and of Cacus. Finally the unspecified Genius, who must certainly be the *Genius publicus* or *Genius populi Romani*, here makes his entrance into history, through a daring enrichment of the concept which he represents. The offerings to the gods, the acts of worship, and the final bargain offered by the praetor are in the Roman tradition: for a long time the *lectisternium*, probably originating from Caere, had been naturalized at Rome, along with its *puluinaria*. In addition to these gods, at Rome itself, since it was the winter season, the principal December god was not neglected (22.1.19–20):

Finally—the month was now December—victims were slain at the temple of Saturn in Rome and a *lectisternium* was ordered—this time senators administered the rite—and a public feast, and throughout the City for a day and a night “Saturnalia” was cried, and the people were bidden to keep that day as a holiday and observe it in perpetuity.

But, far from ceasing, the prodigies multiplied, and the prolonged displeasure of the gods was justified by the impieties of the new consul, Flaminius (21.63.6–14; 22.1.5–7), which Livy relates in detail and which were soon to serve the Romans as an honorable explanation for the disaster of Trasimene, into which Flaminius was about to plunge them. With the coming of spring the historian presents a new balance sheet (22.1.8–13). From Sicily, Sardinia, Praeneste, Arpi, Capena, Caere, Antium, Falerii, and Capua reports of fantastic occurrences, frightening in their childishness, flooded into Rome, and in the city itself the statue of Mars on the Appian Way and those of the wolves which surrounded it broke into sweat. The senators were assembled and heard the evidence, and the consul who was present

requested them to deliberate *de religione*. Without waiting they decided to expiate these prodigies partly with grown victims and partly with sucklings, and to proclaim a three-day *supplicatio* near all the *puluinaria*. For the rest they referred to the decemvirs, who were again instructed to consult the Books. At the recommendation of the decemvirs, particular divinities received gifts; only one of these, Feronia, whose principal sanctuary was in Capena, seems to have been directly responsible for any of the prodigies. These gods are very interesting; this time Rome is resolved to address the highest authorities (22.1.17-19):

Being so admonished by the decemvirs, they decreed that the first gift should be made to Jupiter, a golden thunderbolt weighing fifty pounds; and that Juno and Minerva should be given offerings of silver; that Juno Regina on the Aventine and Juno Sospita at Lanuvium should receive a sacrifice of greater victims, and that the matrons, each contributing as much as she could afford, should make up a sum of money and carry it as a gift to Juno Regina on the Aventine and there celebrate a *lectisternium*; and that even the very freed-women should contribute money, in proportion to their abilities, for an offering to Feronia.

These measures being taken, the decemvirs sacrificed at Ardea in the market-place with the greater victims.

Thus, with Feronia present for other reasons, it is the Capitoline gods, in hierarchical order, and then Juno under various epithets, who are put in charge of the affairs of Rome. The gravity of the moment certainly justifies these appeals, but they also have fitting reasons: in the first list, immediately after the Alpine disaster, Jupiter and his associates had not been specially solicited, and Juno had been mentioned, like Feronia in the later list, only because a double prodigy had occurred in her Lanuvian sanctuary, on her statue and on her *puluinar*. What new elements did the winter bring to the religious conjuncture?

Jupiter and the other Capitoline divinities had just been directly offended by the new consul Flaminius (21.63). As his whole career, both early and recent, had been occupied by conflicts with the Senate and with the *nobilitas* in general, he was afraid that false auspices or the *Feriae Latinae* or other reasons might be alleged to keep him in Rome and prevent him from taking command of the army which had been assigned to him by lot and which was wintering at Placentia.

Consequently, after writing to the consul Sempronius and instructing him to see that the troops were at Ariminum on the Ides of March, he had left Rome on the pretext of taking a trip, and though he was still only *designatus*, and thus *priuatus*, had slipped away to his province. The *Patres* were justly indignant:

... Flaminius, they said, was waging war not only with the senate, but this time with the immortal gods. He had formerly been made consul without the confirmation of the auspices [*inauspicato*], and, though both gods and men had sought to recall him from the very battle-line, he had not obeyed; now, conscious of having spurned them, he had fled the Capitol and the vows that were regularly undertaken, that he might not, on the day of entering upon his office, approach the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus; that he might not see and consult the senate, which hated him and which he alone of all men hated; that he might not proclaim the Latin Festival and offer the accustomed sacrifice to Jupiter Latiaris on the Alban Mount; that he might not, after receiving auspices, go up to the Capitol to make his vows, and thence proceed, in the general's cloak [*paludatus*] and accompanied by lictors, to his province; ...

How could Jupiter O.M., the god of the king and of the king's heirs the consuls, the god of the auspices, and the other Capitoline divinities have failed to be angered by such contemptuous treatment?

As for Juno, we are surely present here at a decisive moment in the evolution of her cult.⁴ To be sure, through her assimilation to Hera, she has been Jupiter's wife for a long time, and this relation has given the word *Regina* its full meaning. But in this difficult year she begins the astonishing mythological career of which the *Aeneid* and Horace give the richest expression:⁵ the protectress of Rome, but a protectress who deserves the particular and unceasing attentions paid to her because she has not always been so, and because, in recollection of her role as a Greek goddess hostile to Troy, she has motives for not being so. The epic of the war with Veii, in which we have substantial reason for discerning the influence of the Trojan epic, had probably sketched out this great scheme: during the ten

4. Latte, for whom Juno is essentially the goddess of women, justifies the ritual attention which is paid to her at this time both by the losses in human life which Rome has just suffered and by the resulting demoralization of the women (p. 257, n. 3).

5. See V. Buchheit, *Vergil über die Sendung Roms* (1963), pp. 11-150 ("Juno's Kampf gegen Rom und ihre Versöhnung"), pp. 173-89 ("Carthago-Rom als Antithese in Aeneis 1-7").

years of the siege, Juno, the Veian Uni, had protected the enemies of Rome, and final victory had been won only through the solemn *euocatio* of the goddess. Allured by great promises, she had abandoned her people and agreed to become a Regina of the Roman people on the Aventine, more active than the Regina who was united with Jupiter on the Capitol. At this point everything seemed to be happily settled, when a new *interpretatio* put Juno once more in the camp of Rome's most formidable enemy: the great goddess and queen of Carthage could be rendered only by the Greek and Latin names of the queen-goddess, Hera and Juno. Was this translation made by the Greeks in Sicily and Italy or by the Romans themselves? It makes little difference: in this era of syncretism Hera was involved with Juno and Juno with Hera. And the Carthaginian Juno, soon to become the *Caelestis*, displayed warlike characteristics which the Roman Juno did not have, or no longer had, but which were apparent in other Latin towns, in Lanuvium for example. For this reason, the double prodigy which had occurred in Juno's temple at Lanuvium, and which in other times would not have been invested with particular significance, must have seemed upon reflection, and after the first *procuratio*, quite specially threatening. The introduction of Dido into the Aeneas cycle, which had probably already been made by the poets, gave a perspective of time and a fatal significance to the confrontation of the colony of Tyre with the Latin refuge of the Trojans, of Dido's people with the descendants of Aeneas. In this sixth century *ab urbe condita* the Juno of the former and Jupiter and Venus, the great gods of the latter people, were renewing the conflict sung long ago by Homer. In this way the war, with its harsh realities, was explained and amplified. At this point, on the threshold of a springtime laden with threats, even though no new prodigy had been proclaimed at Lanuvium during the winter, it is easy to understand why the Juno of that town, Juno Sospita, along with the Juno previously obtained by *euocatio* from Veii, the Regina of the Aventine, was worshiped on equal terms with Jupiter.

Throughout the Second Punic War this *interpretatio* provides one of the guiding lines of Roman ideology, and the Carthaginian himself will strengthen it by adopting⁶ the Greco-Latin Juno-Hera and treating her with the deference due to the goddess of Carthage. In

6. Perhaps he was following a very old Carthaginian tradition; see below, p. 681.

205, with the shift in the fortunes of war, at the moment when Scipio as elected consul is able to ask the Senate to give him Africa as his province, Hannibal raises an altar at the temple of Juno Lacinia, near which he had spent the summer, and has the account of his exploits inscribed on it in Greek and Punic (Liv. 28.46.16). Another tradition, utilized in the *De diuinatione* (1.48), which seems to come from a reliable source, shows the relations between the general and the goddess as more complex but ultimately with the same meaning. This Lacinian temple, close to Crotona, was regarded as the location of a continuous miracle: in the middle of the sacred wood which was surrounded by a thick forest of fir trees there were rich pastures. There, with no herdsman, cattle of every species belonging to Juno grazed, and in the evening each species returned separately to its own stable, without ever being attacked by men or by wild beasts. From the sale of the considerable products of this herd a solid golden column had been raised, so that, according to Livy (24.3.3), the temple, already famous for its sacredness, had become famous also for its wealth. Hannibal wanted to take possession of this column in order to add it to his war treasury; but, before making such a grave decision, he had it probed with an auger to ascertain whether it was really solid gold or merely covered with gold. The test confirmed the claims of the temple and Hannibal gave the order to remove the column. But, during the night he had a dream: Hera forbade him to touch her riches, under pain of losing his remaining eye. He therefore abandoned his project, and from the gold filings which had fallen while the column was being drilled he had made a statuette representing a cow, which he placed on top of the monument. In this connection it has long been realized that the cow was a symbol of the Punic Tanit,⁷ and it has been concluded with some likelihood that Hannibal, by accepting the *interpretatio* of the natives, recognized a form of his country's patron goddess in the Italic goddess.

It was probably around the same time, with the reappearance of hope after the direst fears, or perhaps a little later, *post euentum*, that the famous story of the "heads" found at Carthage was invented.⁸

7. As early as F. Lenormant, *La Grande Grèce* 2 (1881): 227.

8. I sum up here the first part of L. Gerschel's excellent article, "Structures augurales et tripartition fonctionnelle dans la pensée de l'ancienne Rome," *Journal de Psychologie*, 1952, pp. 47-77.

Besides its historical interest, this story gives valuable proof that the ideology of the three functions, as it had been inherited from the Indo-Europeans and as it was expressed in the origins of Rome by the Jupiter-Mars-Quirinus triad, was still alive and present to the mind at the end of the third century.

In the first book of the *Aeneid* Virgil makes a clear allusion to the story (441-47), which his commentator Servius presents in full (443). When Dido, fleeing her brother, landed in Africa, and when the priest was picking out an appropriate location for the establishment of a city, the workmen who were digging excavations for the first buildings uncovered an ox's head. This sign was regarded as unsatisfactory, since the ox is always under the yoke, and they dug elsewhere. Then a horse's head was found, and this was approved. "Consequently," says Servius, "they raised a temple to Juno on that spot; through the omen of the horse Carthage became warlike, and through that of the ox, fertile," *unde et bellicosa Carthago per equi omen et fertilis per bouis*.

It was long thought that Rome was echoing here an authentic Carthaginian legend. It is nothing of the sort: this story is merely the very exact counterpart of the earlier Roman legend which told how a human head, *caput humanum*, was dug up when Tarquin was laying the foundations for the temple of Jupiter O.M., and how this head was seen as a promise that that spot would be the head of the empire: *arcem eam imperii caputque rerum fore portendebat* (Liv. 1.55-6). Lucien Gerschel gives a very good commentary on these facts:

The common theme of these two accounts may be expressed as follows. A king or a queen, wishing to raise a temple to the divinity of his or her sex who is both supreme and celestial, orders the excavation of the ground; those working on the foundations bring to light one or more heads of living creatures; an omen is taken from this discovery, and this omen, which proclaims the future greatness of the city, is to be interpreted in various ways, depending on the nature of the exhumed head.

This theme is too specific for the two accounts, applied to two great rival cities, to be independent of each other. As there is nothing to suggest a common prototype, and as it is unlikely that the Roman account grew out of the Carthaginian account, we should consider, all other hypotheses being excluded, that the story of Dido was copied from the story of Tarquin, that it owes nothing to the Punic religion, and that it is wholly Roman. Religious-

mindful, careful, precise men, attentive to the messages of the gods, men to whom the handling of omens was a familiar exercise, had reflected on Carthage's career and had sought to discover the sources of her wealth and military power. Where we should invoke sociological, historical, and geographical reasons to account for the development of her strength, these men, the ancient Romans, thought in terms of their own city and of the traditions which somehow made the world begin in Rome's origins and which caused the benefits and attentions of the gods to encompass the Urbs, as the fairies in fairy tales gather around the cradle of a newborn child.

Outraged by the *fides punica*, astonished at Carthage's wealth and military prowess, they saw in this city, which was founded before their own city and had become its rival, another Rome which would not and could not succeed in winning supremacy, but whose brilliant career could be imagined only as a function of the same religious practices as Rome's and with the same divine support, without which nothing permanent or valid can exist. In this way the idea was born that Carthage, coming before Rome, was able through certain elements in her history to foreshadow Rome, and that she attempted certain things in the same areas where Rome was later successful.

Gerschel shows that none of the other witnesses of the legend (Justin. 18.5; Eustathius *ad Dionysium Periegetem* 195 ff.) gives a reason for attributing it to the Carthaginians themselves. Eustathius does indeed add two factors in the determining of the site of the future Carthage, the lack of drinkable water and the presence of a palm tree at the spot where the head will be discovered; but these are two geographic indications designating an African locale, and moreover the palm tree may have been suggested by the play on words which was possible only in Greek, and not in a Semitic language, between *Phoinikes* "Phoenicians" and *phoenix* "palm tree." Gerschel goes even further: commenting on the Punic coins on which the image of a horse is often associated with that of a palm tree, he offers a plausible reconstruction of the process whereby, from certain of these coins interpreted in terms of the Capitoline legend of the *caput humanum*, the Romans fabricated the allegedly Carthaginian legend:⁹

Carthage did not begin to strike coins until relatively late, and first of all in Sicily, after contact with and in imitation of the Greek towns. The Greek coins from Sicily, taken as models by the Carthaginians, already often bore

9. These lines are opposed to a thesis of J. Bayet's brilliant article, "L'omen du cheval à Carthage: Timée, Virgile et le monnayage punique," *REL* 19 (1941): 166-90 (reprinted in *Mélanges de littérature latine* [1967], pp. 255-80).

the image of a horse, so that this image, far from characterizing the Punic coins, required on the contrary a complementary, differential symbol, which was furnished by the Greek *phoinix-Phoinikes* pun, with the palm tree having the additional advantage of readily suggesting the African locale. . . . What appears most commonly on the Carthaginian coins, as on the Greek coins from Sicily, is a whole horse, and not just a head: it is thus quite unlikely that there was at Carthage itself a legend about a "horse's head," whereas a Roman interpretation of the coins showing only the head (but in which the head is probably only the "abstract" of a whole horse, just as human heads on so many coins are the abstract of a man) might, by reference to the *caput humanum* of the Capitol, have favored the formation of an antithetical and hierarchically inferior legend of a *caput equi*. . . . Finally it is not without interest to note that the coins provide nothing equivalent to the ox's head mentioned by Servius, Justin, and Eustathius, to which, despite more recent opinions, the words *et felicem uictu* in the *Aeneid* very probably allude, and which is meaningful only in the tripartite Roman perspective, completing on the lowest level the scheme begun at the top with the human head and the horse's head.

In fact, in Roman terms, the providential design which is revealed is clear:

Dido found the ox's head which assures Carthage of fertility, plenty, and economic power. Thanks to Juno, Dido later found the horse's head which, adding strength to wealth, promises that Carthage, a military power, will be free and respected. But here her luck ends. Transposed to the world scale, the third and then the second of the Indo-European social functions were conceded to Carthage by the Roman scholars; but they naturally saved the first for Rome, and it is Tarquin who exhumes the human head, an unequivocal presage of sovereignty (Serv. *Aen.* 8.345: *is locus orbi imperaret, in quo illud caput esset inuentum*; cf. Liv. 1.55.5-6; 5.54.7).

This lesson is all the more remarkable in that it is expressed through homogeneous images, by three hierarchically ordered heads, which are also associated in the same order in a Vedic religious structure: explicit brahmanic texts declare that the animals suitable for sacrifice are five in number, namely, in decreasing order of dignity, man, horse, ox, sheep, and goat.¹⁰ The first three of these furnished their

10. S. Lévi, *La doctrine du sacrifice dans les Brāhmaṇas* (1898; reprinted 1967), pp. 133-38. The *suouetaurilia* and the *sautrāmaṇi* on one hand, and certain Indian sacrifices on the other are based on other arrangements of this list or of the equivalent Roman list; above, pp. 237-40.

heads to the legend of the temple of Capitoline Jupiter, and to the complementary and "made in Rome" legend of the temple of Carthaginian Juno.

This is doubtless a small matter, but it confirms the worry which the "Juno" of Dido and her city caused the Romans from the disaster at the Trebia until their revenge at Zama.

Under these conditions, perhaps it is wrong to suspect the *exoratio* of this Juno which is supposed to have been made in the course, or probably rather at the end of the Second Punic War. Commenting on the lines of the twelfth book of the *Aeneid*, in which Juno finally, and joyously, resigns herself to adopting Aeneas and his descendants, after Jupiter has promised her an exceptionally splendid cult at Rome (*nec gens ulla tuos aeque celebrabit honores*), Servius tells us briefly that this divine incident in legendary prehistory is the transposition of a historical fact: *sed constat bello Punico secundo exoratum Junonem, tertio uero bello a Scipione sacris quibusdam etiam Romam esse translatam*. In fact it is quite possible, given the importance of the stakes, as well as the Veian precedent, that the archaic rites of *captatio beneuolentiae* were applied exceptionally to a foreign goddess whom a trick of translation had made the mighty Greco-Latin goddess, the enemy of Troy and of Aeneas. For the same reason we perhaps must not reject the idea that in the Third Punic War in the following century, before the destruction of Carthage, Scipio Aemilianus and his priests may have evoked the gods, and particularly, without naming her, the Juno of that city. The text of this *euocatio* was preserved by Macrobius (3.9.7-8), following Furius, one of Scipio's contemporaries: *Si deus si dea est cui populus ciuitasque Carthaginiensis est in tutela*,¹¹ *teque maxime, ille qui urbis huius populi que tutelam recepisti, precor ueneror ueniamque a uobis peto ut uos populum ciuitatemque Carthaginiensem deseratis. . . . Si ita feceritis, uoueo uobis templa ludosque facturum*.

It is not known where the statue thus transferred to Rome, with or without *euocatio*, was set down: no temple was built for it, and F. Cumont and V. Basanoff thought that it was lodged in the temple of Juno Moneta from 146 to 122, until the day when the *Colonia Iunonia* of C. Gracchus resuscitated Carthage for the benefit of Rome, and a

11. It is clear from what follows (*teque maxime*) that *si deus si dea est cui . . .* does not indicate a doubt concerning the sex of some particular divinity (see the commentary in *DL*, p. 79, n. 3), but means "all the gods and goddesses who . . ."

new temple of Juno "Caelestis" could receive it not far from its former African site.¹²

But let us return to the events of the spring of 217, that is, very briefly, to the disaster of Lake Trasimene. The historian is merciless in his blame of Flaminius, recording the blasphemies and impieties which that free-thinking man accumulated until the fatal day. One feels that the Romans took comfort and as it were a defense against despair from the thought that these were the faults of a single man. The reason for their misfortunes was obvious, and with Flaminius and his legions dead, they could imagine that the wrath of the gods was ready to be appeased. Q. Fabius Maximus, who was about to win the famous nickname of Cunctator, formulates this comforting lesson (22.9.7-11):

Quintus Fabius Maximus, dictator now for the second time, convened the senate on the day he entered upon his office. Taking up first the question of religion, he convinced the Fathers that the consul Flaminius had erred more through his neglect of the ceremonies and the auspices than through his recklessness and ignorance; and asserting that they ought to enquire of the gods themselves how the displeasure of the gods might be appeased, prevailed with them to do what is rarely done except when dreadful prodigies [*taetra prodigia*] have been announced, and order the decemvirs to consult the Sibylline Books. When the decemvirs had inspected the Books of Fate [*inspectis fatalibus libris*], they reported to the Fathers that the vow which had been made to Mars on account of this war had not been duly performed, and must be performed afresh and on an ampler scale; that great games must be vowed to Jupiter, and temples to Venus Erycina and to Mens; and finally that a supplication and *lectisternium* must be celebrated in honour of the gods, and a Sacred Spring be vowed, if they proved victorious and the state remained as it had been before the outbreak of hostilities. The senate, seeing that Fabius would be occupied with the conduct of the war, commanded Marcus Aemilius the praetor, as the college of pontifices had recommended, to see that all these measures were promptly put into effect.

How can we fail to admire the persistence and ingenuity of these administrators of the sacred, who, as the misfortunes continue, consult the Books three times within a few weeks and draw from them three totally different injunctions? Jupiter, whose anger is

12. V. Basanoff, *Euocatio*, p. 63-66 ("Juno Caelestis de Carthage, 1. *exoratio*, 2. *euocatio*").

real and who has just made sure that there will be no doubt of this through his punishment of Flaminius, continues to be supplicated. But in the bloody and desperate battle of Trasimene, Mars, who had already been giving threatening signs at Falerii and Porta Capena (22.1.11-12), had not shown himself to be the father of the Romans: rather he was *Mars caecus*, blind as the consul without auspices, blind in battle, in the befogged defile of Trasimene, rejoicing in combat for combat's sake and in the sheer intoxication of all the combatants. "It was no ordered battle," says Livy (22.5.7-8), "with the troops marshalled in triple line, nor did the vanguard fight before the standards and the rest of the army behind them, neither did each soldier keep to his proper legion cohort and maniple: it was chance that grouped them, and every man's own valour assigned him his post in van or rear; and such was the frenzy of their eagerness and so absorbed were they in fighting, that an earthquake, violent enough to overthrow large portions of many of the towns of Italy, turn swift streams from their courses, carry the sea up into rivers, and bring down mountains with great landslides, was not even felt by any of the combatants." This irregular behavior of Mars must have had a cause: it was found, and to bring this mighty power back to the interests of Rome an ill-made vow was made again, on a larger scale.

But the other divinities proposed for special honors at this time, the Venus of Eryx and Mens, are even more remarkable.

If the legend of Romulus presented Mars as the ancestor of the Romans, the legend of Aeneas made Venus their grandmother or, more graciously, their mother. As we have seen,¹³ at the time of the First Punic War the Trojans at Segesta and the Trojans of Rome had already claimed each other as brothers, and the legionaries entrenched on Mount Eryx had fiercely and successfully defended a goddess who was already theirs, not by borrowing but by inheritance. The Aphrodite of Eryx, thus summoned, more than other Aphrodites, to give substance to and to orient the Roman concept of Venus, was a complex, even a composite goddess, in whom Semitic elements were mixed with Greek representations, and in whom the aspect of pleasure and fertility was dominant.¹⁴ She was served by sacred prostitutes,

13. Above, p. 454.

14. On Venus Erycina and the Romanization of the cult, see Robert Schilling, *La religion romaine de Vénus* (1955), pp. 242-66.

and the ears of wheat and the doves one sees portrayed on coins connected her with the Oriental goddesses, from Cyprus and from more remote places. But for the Romans, apparently, the memory of their prolonged defense of Mount Eryx caused another aspect, another strength of the goddess, to be dominant: she was the giver of victory. The Roman coins which portray her bestow a diadem and a crown of laurel on her, and sometimes the reverse of the coin, in an annotation of the obverse, shows a Victory with a palm branch and a wreath, mounted on a quadriga in full career, or else advancing on foot and bearing a trophy. Was it not natural for the Latin Aeneads, in their trials of 217, to appeal to this august and remote relative who had visibly favored their arms some decades earlier, and in her own home? Q. Fabius Maximus therefore vowed her a temple, which he dedicated two years later on 23 April, the day of the spring Vinalia, just as the temple of Venus Obsequens, vowed in 295 by his grandfather Fabius Gurgus, celebrated its *dies natalis* on 19 August, the day of the summer Vinalia. Schilling sees in this a repeated intention to associate Venus with Jupiter, the master of the Vinalia.¹⁵ Moreover, the site chosen for the temple proves clearly that Venus Erycina was not received as a stranger: not only inside the *pomerium*, as it was comprised in the third century, but on the hill of the great national divinities, and close to Jupiter O.M., whose favor she begs, in the poetical accounts of the time, on behalf of Aeneas.¹⁶ Finally, the cult of the goddess was thoroughly Romanized: neither the sacred prostitutes nor other Sicilian practices were retained; and on 23 April a new rite involving the pouring out of wine—enormous quantities of wine poured into the gutter from her temple¹⁷—connected her closely with the traditional festival and with the legend in which Jupiter grants victory to Aeneas.

The seriousness of the times explains well enough why the most pleasurable aspects were eliminated from the Erycinian cult. But, once the fortunes of Rome had been restored, the goddess received

15. Ibid., pp. 95-97, 248. On Venus Obsequens, ibid., pp. 28-29, 50.

16. R. Schilling, "Le temple de Vénus Capitoline et la tradition pomériale," *RPh.* 23 (1949): 27-35, where the author shows first that in the third century the Capitol was indeed included in the *pomerium*. P. Catalano, "Pomerio," *Novissimo digesto italiano*, 1965, pp. 3-12, sums up clearly the very complex problems, which have been unnecessarily complicated by certain exegetes, connected with the idea of *pomerium*.

17. "QII. 15 ('Le mythe des Vinalia priora')," *REL* 39 (1961): 266-70.

compensation for this. During the war against the Ligurians in 184, the consul L. Porcius Licinius vowed a second temple to the Venus of Eryx, and dedicated it three years later, when he was a duumvir, outside the city and close to the Colline Gate. This temple, whose *dies natalis* also fell on 23 April (Ov. *F.* 4.871–72), served as the frame for a cult which was much closer to the Sicilian model and much more spectacular. The building itself, which was included in the precinct of the famous gardens of Sallust in the following century, was a splendid structure in which a costly statue of the goddess was housed. Ovid writes, on the day of her festival and in connection with the *lauatio* (ibid. 133–39):

Duly do ye worship the goddess, ye Latin mothers and brides, and ye, too, who wear not the fillets and long robe. Take off the golden necklaces from the marble neck of the goddess; take off her gauds [*divitias*]; the goddess must be washed from top to toe. Then dry her neck and restore to it her golden necklaces; now give her other flowers, now give her the fresh-blown rose. Ye, too, she herself bids, bathe under the green myrtle . . .

Beauty, luxury, pleasure: Aphrodite and Astarte have been installed *extra pomerium*. The women who are addressed as *uos quis uittae longaque uestis abest* are the wanton women of the capital, the *uulgares puellae* whom Ovid still invites to request of Venus, with puffs of incense and amid the mint and myrtle and garlands of roses, beauty and the favor of the people, the art of caresses and the words which befit the entertainment in which they specialize (ibid. 865–68). It is to this Venus that the religious rule refers which, of course, the architect says was taken over from the Etruscans (Vitr. 1.7.1):¹⁸ for various reasons, the sanctuaries of four divinities, Mars, Volcanus, Venus, and Ceres, had to be located outside the walls. The reason given for thus excluding Venus is that “the passions inspired by the goddess must be kept away from adolescents and the mothers of families”¹⁹

In 217 the Sibylline Books and the execution of their orders combine, with a definite intent, Venus Erycina and another new divinity, Mens, who is typically Roman, a personified abstraction representing

18. Above, pp. 206, 320.

19. On Venus's sanctuaries in Rome, see Platner, *TD*, pp. 551–59.

reflection, judgment, the opposite of rash temerity.²⁰ Long ago it was noted how this promotion of the virtue of intelligence was opportune: *Mens* is the quality which Flaminius most lacked, and which the Cunctator, in his dictatorship, intends to set against Hannibal's masterly genius. When one reads Livy's subsequent chapters, in which the extreme prudence of Fabius is constantly contrasted with the demagogic recklessness of his *magister equitum*, one is struck by the accord between the dictator's tactics and the advice, instigated by him, of the Sibylline Books: there must have been secret avenues of communication leading from this great man to the wise decemvirs. To describe Fabius's conduct high on the slopes of the Apennines, Livy uses a number of words which are as it were the common currency of *Mens*: *cautus*, *consilia*, *sollertia*, which he contrasts with *temeritas* and frequently with *fortuna*—that *Fortuna* who had received a *supplicatio* on Mount Algidus at the start of the preceding winter, and who, as blind as Mars, had paid it no heed. At least once the historian uses the great word: even in the Senate, he says (22.25.14), Fabius has only a limited audience when he reveals that the defeats of the past two years were suffered *per temeritatem atque inscientiam ducum*; that his Master of the Horse will be brought to account for having gone into action against orders; and that, if the supreme command, with full direction of the war, is entrusted to him, he will soon show that to a good commander fortune counts for little and that what counts is intelligence and calculation, *bono imperatori haud magni fortunam momenti esse, mentem rationemque dominari*. Schilling thinks that in the "Trojan" context of the foundation *Mens* did indeed allude to his virtue, especially as it was embodied in Aeneas, the son of Venus and the father of the Romans.²¹ This is possible: it is a property of happy inventions that they can be explained and can be used in a variety of coherent ways. In any case, the double vow was made with a meaningful hierarchization in which *Mens* becomes as it were an attendant of Venus Erycina. The temple of the Sicilian goddess was promised by the dictator in person, "the *libri fatales* having prescribed that the gift should be made by the man who then held the

20. There is no definite reason for regarding *Mens* as Greek, and the establishment of her cult on the Capitol suggests that she was not; Latte, p. 240, contrary to Wiss., pp. 313-15.

21. Schilling, *La religion romaine de Vénus*, pp. 250-53; cf. *Pietas* combined with the second Erycina, p. 255.

maximum imperium in the state," and it was a praetor who promised the temple of Mens. Both were built on adjacent sites on the Capitol, and were dedicated at the same time (Liv. 23.30.9), Fabius having asked for and received permission to make the dedication to Venus, and with the praetor again dedicating the *aedes Mentis*.

The decemvirs did not stop at this: in the divine commands which they transmitted they combined the most radical of the ancient procedures and the most remarkable of the new: a sacred spring and a collective lectisternium, the former directed to Jupiter—an unusual recipient—and the latter bringing together twelve great gods in accordance with Greek theology. The sacred spring had fallen into disuse to such a degree that the *pontifex maximus* had to remind them that such a vow could be made only at the command of the assembled people. The people were accordingly assembled, and a text was submitted to them of which the structure, if not all of the words, seems authentic (22.10.2-6):²²

Do you will and so order that these things be done in the manner following? If the Republic of the Roman People, the Quirites, shall be preserved for the next five years—as I would wish it preserved—in these wars, to wit, the war of the Roman People of Carthage and the wars with the Gauls on this side of the Alps, let the Roman People, the Quirites, offer up in indefeasible sacrifice to Jupiter what the spring shall have produced of swine, sheep, goats and cattle—which shall not have been consecrated to some other deity—beginning with the day which the senate and the People shall have designated. Let him who shall make a sacrifice do so at such time and by such rite as shall seem good to him; in what manner soever he does it, let it be accounted duly done. If the animal which he ought to sacrifice dies, let it be deemed unconsecrate and let no guilt attach to him; if any shall hurt it or slay it unawares, let it be no sin; if any shall steal it, let no guilt attach to the People nor to him from whom it shall have been stolen; if he shall sacrifice unwittingly on a black day, let the sacrifice be deemed to have been duly made; by night or by day, if slave or freeman perform the sacrifice, let it be deemed to have been duly made; if sacrifice shall be performed before the senate and the People shall have ordered it to be performed, let the People be absolved therefrom and free of obligation.

22. This *uer sacrum* will be performed twenty-one years later, in 195, and because of an irregularity, it will be begun again in 194, like the Great Games which had been promised at the same time to Jupiter, 33.44.1-2. This *uer sacrum* concerns only the *pecus* and not, like those of earlier times, human beings. To tell the truth, this is the only known case in historical times (above, p. 237, n. 49); it has been very well discussed by E. Eisenhut, *RE* VIII A (1955), cols. 912-15 (difficulties in Livy's text; interpretation).

This formula is a handsome monument to the prudence and the common sense which the religious experts of Rome brought to the regulation of the most highly artificial matters. As the principal offended party, Jupiter was promised that the sum of 333,333 *as* would be spent on the Great Games, and that three hundred oxen would be sacrificed to him, with many other gods receiving white oxen and the remaining minor victims (*ibid.* 8). Livy continues:

When the vows had been duly pronounced, a supplication was decreed, and was performed not only by the urban population, with their wives and children, but by such country folk besides, as, having some fortune of their own, were beginning to feel concern for the Commonwealth.

Here we see the appearance of care not to neglect any god, and yet to preserve the hierarchy: *Joui . . . multis aliis diuis . . . ceteris*. The same intention, but with a more modern illumination, governs the famous lectisternium of this year (*ibid.* 9): since there were twelve "great powers" of Olympus, the divinities invited to the banquet are likewise twelve in number, in six pairs:

A lectisternium was then celebrated during three days under the supervision of the decemvirs who had charge of sacrifices. Six couches were displayed: one for Jupiter and Juno, a second for Neptune and Minerva, a third for Mars and Venus, a fourth for Apollo and Diana, a fifth for Vulcan and Vesta, a sixth for Mercury and Ceres.

These names of the twelve Great Gods and the associations into which they are placed reveal the Hellenization of Roman religion. If the last two pairs can be explained in Roman as well as Greek terms, one by the "fire" element shared by its two members, and the other by the affinity of commerce and grain, it is the Greek mythology alone which justifies the first four pairs: we must read them as Zeus-Hera, Poseidon-Athena, Ares-Aphrodite, and Apollo-Artemis. These groupings do not raise any of the problems which arose, for example, from one of the groupings in the first collective lectisternium of six gods, in 399; there it was easy to see why Latona should be joined with Apollo and Mercury with Neptune, but less easy to understand why Diana should be paired with Hercules.²³

It is striking—let us say in passing—that Hercules, who had figured in the known collective lectisterniums of the fourth century, has no

23. J. Bayet, *Les origines de l'Hercule romain* (1926), pp. 278–85, tries to explain it.

part in the divine honors of this year. To be sure, he could not be present in a lectisternium which gathered only the "Twelve Great Gods" of the Greeks. But why is he not worshiped apart, as are Mars, Mens, and the Erycina? Jean Bayet thinks that in the Greek revival of Roman religion, Hercules somehow suffered from having been too soon and too completely Romanized.²⁴ This is not certain: thoroughly Romanized as he was, Hercules was still quite Greek, and he was constantly being enriched and strengthened by the legends of Herakles. Furthermore, a few weeks earlier during the same crisis, was not Hercules appealed to for help in association with Juventas, under which it is easy to recognize the Herakles-Hebe pairing? The reason is rather the following: except for the three great Capitoline divinities, these ceremonies after Trasimene do not honor by name any of the divinities invoked after Trebia; the new disaster has lowered them in rank, as if they had demonstrated their indifference or their inadequacy. An appeal is now made to other divinities, to Mens rather than to Fortuna, to Mars rather than to Genius, to Venus rather than to Juventas. Is not Hercules' elimination an expression of this same movement, not so much a demotion as a certified report of his incapacity to adjust to the circumstances?

Schilling commented strongly on another aspect of this reallocation of the gods.²⁵ Although the pairings are explained by Greek mythology, several of them receive a complementary meaning in the Roman perspective: Jupiter and Juno are the king and queen of the gods, but their union is an ancient one at Rome, carrying in itself all that centuries of local history attached to it. And above all, Venus and Mars are no longer merely the stormy pair who afforded the Alexandrians so much fun: "Great as the part of Hellenism may have been in this combination, still new to the Romans, we must not forget the national quality of the two partners: Mars is the old warrior-god who has presided over the success of Roman arms, while Venus appears more and more as the tutelary power of the nation of the Aeneades. Further, it was not a question at Rome of a couple in the strict sense of the term. The Greek precedent seems merely to have suggested to the Romans the idea of associating the two essential personages of their history: Aeneas, the founder of the nation, and

24. *Ibid.*, pp. 261-62.

25. *La religion romaine de Vénus*, pp. 207-8.

Romulus, the founder of the City. Such was incontestably the meaning at Rome of the Venus-Mars pairing."

This is how Roman religion appears, in the details of its activity, during these first difficult years. The lull brought about by Fabius's prudence did not prevent the continuation of prodigies, but as they no longer occurred after a defeat, they must have made a less vivid impression on the mind—the prodigies were a regular, annual experience of the Roman people—and Livy confines himself to saying that the appropriate formulas were drawn from the Sibylline Books to nullify them (22.36.9). Moreover, they were counterbalanced by the delicate attention of a loyal ally, Hiero of Syracuse, who sent the Romans a solid gold statue of Victory, with a request that they keep it forever; though they refused other gifts, the senators accepted this one, attributing to it the significance of a presage (22.37.10–12): "the Victory and her omen they did accept; and to that goddess they dedicated and assigned the Capitol, the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, to be her seat. Established in that citadel of Rome she would be gracious and propitious, faithful and steadfast, to the Roman People."

We cannot follow in detail the religious events of this long war, which has only just begun. It should be noted, however, that after the disaster of Cannae the reaction was quite different from that provoked by Trasimene. To be sure, the circumstances were different: though foolhardy, the plebeian consul Varro had not offended Jupiter, but had complied with the auspices, correctly deferring battle as long as the chickens did not advise it—which allows the historian to say that on that day the gods themselves at least postponed, though they could not prevent, the calamity which was to befall the Romans (22.42.10). The only one of the divinities whom he might have directly offended was Mens, whose temple, though promised, had not yet been dedicated. Under these conditions, Q. Fabius, to whom Rome once more entrusted her fate, did not add to the religious improvisations; he imposed a minimum time for mourning, canceled the festivals of Ceres, which could be celebrated only with rejoicing (22.55–56), and, like a wise man, undertook once more to explore the realm of the divine in order to localize there the source of the misfortune. At Rome itself, probably through human agency, sacrileges were dis-

covered: two Vestals were convicted of sexual incontinence; one of them was buried alive at the Colline Gate, the traditional punishment for this offense, while the other killed herself, and her lover, one of the lesser pontiffs, was beaten to death. In addition the Sibylline Books were consulted, in which the decemvirs read the order for a certain number of *sacrificia extraordinaria*, the scope of which corresponded to the gravity of the menace: a pair of Gauls, male and female, and a pair of Greeks were buried alive in the *Forum boarium*, in an enclosure walled in by huge rocks.²⁶ At last, when consultation of the Books, undertaken so often, had proved unavailing, it was decided that Apollo should be consulted in his own home, at Delphi. A relative of the dictator, Q. Fabius Pictor, perhaps himself one of the decemvirs,²⁷ was sent to ask the oracle about the forms of prayer and sacrifice necessary for placating the wrath of the gods and to find out what end the Romans might expect of their overwhelming disasters. The emissary left promptly and returned just as promptly with the written response of the oracle. This response told them, in verse, the names of the gods to whom prayer was to be offered, and according to what rites, and continued with these sentences, in which can be seen, as it were, a long-range treaty of alliance between Rome and the Delphic god (23.11.2-3): "If you do thus, Romans, your situation will be better and easier, and your state will go on more in accordance with your desire, and the Roman people will have the victory in the war. When you have successfully administered and preserved your state, from the gains made you shall send a gift to Pythian Apollo and do honour to him out of the booty, the profits and the spoils. You shall keep yourselves from exulting"—*lasciua*, a fine translation of the Greek *hybris*. Livy continues (*ibid.* 4-6):

After reading these words translated from the Greek verses, he went on to say that, on coming out of the oracle, he had at once made offerings to all those divinities with incense and wine; also that he had been bidden by the high-priest of the temple, just as he had come to the oracle and also conducted the rite while wearing a garland of laurel, so also to wear the garland when he boarded the ship, and not to lay it aside until he should reach Rome. Further, that he had carried out with the utmost scrupulosity

26. Above, pp. 449-50.

27. He is the 126th Fabius in the catalog of RE VI, cols. 1836-41.

and care all the instructions given him, and had then laid the wreath upon the altar of Apollo at Rome.

This is an important moment in the development of the Roman cult of Apollo. It will be followed shortly (26.23.3) by the order making the Games of Apollo, vowed by the urban praetor in 212 in obedience to the "oracles" called the *carmina Marciana*, an annual event.²⁸ Since Cannae was the last great Roman setback, the embassy to Delphi must have seemed the turning point of fate.

To be sure, there will be more threatening prodigies (24.10.6-12; 44.7-8; etc.), nullified at the order of the pontiffs and in accordance with the counsel of the Books, but that was quite different from the religious terror of the years 218-215, which had compelled the guardians of religion to explore and to make use of all its resources. As the years went by, Rome regained her confidence and assurance, and felt that she was reconciled with the gods. When Hannibal, after missing his greatest chances, encamped a few miles from the city (26.10.3), and proceeded in person at the head of his cavalry as far as the temple of Hercules just outside the Porta Collina, the alarm did not become a panic, and after the gods had twice prevented any engagement, by means of a hailstorm, Hannibal withdrew, in his wrath sacking the shrine of Feronia at Capena. In one of the beautiful passages of his poem, at the end of the twelfth book (703-25), Silius Italicus gives a fine expression of the Roman feelings, when he describes the protectors of Rome rising up before the Carthaginian. Each god appears above his own shrine or his own district, and in this way the poet, through selection composes an ensemble in which everything save the first element—Apollo on the Palatine—is remarkably archaic:

"Madman, whither are you rushing? [says Juno, seizing Hannibal by the hand.] Are you intent on a warfare that is beyond the power of mortal man?" Thus speaking, she dispersed the cloud of darkness and revealed herself in her real semblance. "You have not now to do with settlers from Troy or Laurentum. Look up and see! For I will remove the cloud for a space from your eyes and suffer you to behold all things. Where yonder peak rises high, the Palatine, so named by the Arcadian king [Evander], is held by Apollo; he makes ready for battle, his full quiver rattles, and his bow is bent. Again,

28. This decision was not carried out: Liv. 27.11.6; 23.5-7. Cf. J. Gagé, *Apollon romain* (1955), pp. 257-96, "La crise oraculaire et l'institution des Jeux Apollinaires (212-208)."

where the tall pile of the Aventine rises beside the other hills, see you how the maiden daughter of Latona brandishes torches kindled in the stream of Phlegethon, and thrusts forth her bared arms in her eagerness for battle? Then look elsewhere and see how Mars, the fierce warrior, has filled all the field named after himself. Janus from one side and Quirinus from another, each god from his own hill, come forth to war. . . . Turn your face hither and dare to look at [Jupiter] the Thunder-god. When he shakes his head, what storms, what mighty bolts you see obedient to his nod!"

And the goddess carries Hannibal off *mirantem superum uultus et flammea membra*.

Rome's last great scare comes in the year 207, when Hasdrubal crosses Gaul and approaches the Alps with the reinforcements for which Hannibal has been waiting so long. The two consuls who will defeat him at the Metaurus have barely been appointed, and have not even left the city, when a series of prodigies, such as might be expected in times of great public anxiety, are announced at Veii, Minturnae, and Capua. Scarcely has one lot received its ceremonies of expiation before others have to be dealt with. Especially disturbing was the birth of a baby, of indeterminate sex, as large as a four-year-old child; haruspices called in from Etruria pronounced it to be *foedum ac turpe prodigium*, and on their advice it was put in a box alive and thrown into the sea out of Roman territory. The gravity of the situation and the multiplication of evil omens inspired the pontiffs to a new effort (Liv. 27.37.7-15):

. . . The pontiffs likewise decreed that thrice nine maidens should sing a hymn as they marched through the city. While they were in the temple of Jupiter Stator, learning that hymn, composed by Livius the poet, the temple of Juno the Queen on the Aventine was struck by lightning. That this portent concerned the matrons was the opinion given by the soothsayers, and that the goddess must be appeased by a gift; whereupon the matrons domiciled in the city of Rome or within ten miles of it were summoned by an edict of the curule aediles to the Capitol. And from their own number they themselves chose twenty-five, to whom they should bring a contribution from their dowries. Out of that a golden basin was made as a gift and carried to the Aventine, and the matrons after due purification offered sacrifice.

At once a day was appointed by the decemvirs for another sacrifice to the same goddess; and the order of procedure was as follows: from the temple of Apollo two white cows were led through the Porta Carmentalis into the

city; behind them were carried two statues of Juno the Queen in cypress wood. Then the seven and twenty maidens in long robes marched, singing their hymn in honour of Juno the Queen, a song which to the untrained minds of that time may have deserved praise, but now, if repeated, would be repellent and uncouth. Behind the company of maidens followed the decemvirs wearing laurel garlands and purple-bordered togas. From the gate they proceeded along the Vicus Jugarius into the Forum. In the Forum the procession halted, and passing a rope from hand to hand the maidens advanced, accompanying the sound of the voice by beating time with their feet. Then by way of the Vicus Tuscus and the Velabrum, through the Forum Boarium they made their way to the Clivus Publicius and the temple of Juno the Queen. There the two victims were sacrificed by the decemvirs and the cypress statue borne into the temple.

Some have claimed to discern here a rivalry of the priesthoods, an attempt by each to outbid the others, showing that the general edginess had affected the priests themselves and indicating a kind of religious anarchy. Does Livy's account really lend itself to this interpretation?²⁹ It is the prodigies which are anarchic and uncoordinated because of their fortuitous nature: the state and the pontiffs attend to them as best they can, through the ordinary channels, consulting the haruspices, listening to the decemvirs, and dreaming up a new ceremony. It has been suggested that the decemvirs, intervening on their own initiative, had diverted to Juno's temple the procession

29. In his article "La crise religieuse de 207 avant J. C.," *RHR* 126 (1943): 15-41, J. Cousin, studying in great detail the prodigies and *procuraciones* of 207, defends Livy's account very well against the numerous exegeses of which it had been the object. Among other things, he shows that there was no attempt on the part of the decemvirs to monopolize Juno Regina or any of the rites: "In truth, they had nothing to monopolize, since the case of 'procuring' these prodigies and the service of the cult reverted to them; it is a question of counsels inspired by the Sibylline Books which were in their custody. . . . With regard to the text which concerns us, it is hard to see how any argument can be validated which tends to demonstrate any abuse of power or excess of zeal on their part. The formalist spirit of the Romans would not have accommodated itself to this maneuver, and the gods would scarcely have been 'appeased.'" Against K. Barwick, the author shows that there is no reason for withholding from Livius Andronicus the merit of having composed the *carmen* (pp. 37-40). He also stresses that the treatment of the hermaphrodite baby, which created a precedent, seems to be an innovation of this year (pp. 19, 40). He rightly specifies (p. 25, n. 1) that there is no occasion for trying to make Livy contradict himself in the various passages where the *procuratio* of prodigies is involved: if the historian does not always mention the initiative taken by the Senate, the order given by them to the decemvirs to consult the Books, it is because this procedure was the usual one and was followed automatically. He determines exactly the division of competencies among the haruspices (mere occasional counselors), the decemvirs (official consultants of the Books), and the curule aediles (administrative representatives of the state) (pp. 34-35).

which the pontiffs had originally placed under the sign of Jupiter. It does not seem so: the pontiffs prescribed a procession through the city in which there is no suggestion of a particular orientation to Jupiter; to be sure, given the danger, the rehearsals are intentionally held in the temple of Jupiter Stator, but these are only preparations; what reorients the undertaking toward Juno Regina is the new prodigy, the thunderbolt falling on her shrine at the very moment when the young girls are rehearsing their hymn. The great number of measures taken thereafter to placate this goddess can be explained by the reasons given above: in this war against Dido's city, anything which seems to indicate discontent or hostility on the part of Juno, who was always suspected of Punic sympathies, touches the Romans on a sensitive point. Thus it is natural, after the gift prescribed by the haruspices, that the decemvirs should also be consulted on such an important point, for it is highly unlikely that they would intervene or fix a day of sacrifice without being invited to do so by the state and the religious establishment; it is also natural that the itinerary *per urbem*, if it was already scheduled, should be adjusted so as to end at the goddess's temple. These convergent activities show rather a harmonious, regular collaboration of all the experts in fulfillment of the same need: the appeasement of the goddess whom a distant, pre-Roman past links to Carthage, just as a more recent past had linked her to Veii before her installation on the Aventine. And there is even less reason to imagine a rivalry between the priesthoods, since the two social classes, the plebeians and the patricians, on the very eve of the expiation of the prodigies, join forces harmoniously in rendering homage to their respective gods: *ludi Romani* for three days, celebrated by the curule aediles with the *epulum Jouis*; *ludi plebei* for three days and the offering of three statues to Ceres by the plebeian aediles (Liv. 27.36.8-9). Is not this the opposite of confusion?

However, even though the danger was past and Cannae had been avenged at the Metaurus, Hannibal stubbornly refused to leave southern Italy. Even the first threats to Africa failed to shake his purpose. This final emergency was the source of another extension of Rome's religious capital. From beyond Greece, from Asia Minor, on the pretext of the legend of Troy, the Senate requested a new protection.

Ever since Philip of Macedon had had the dangerous idea of

interfering, against Rome, in Roman affairs, the Romans had found it necessary to make sure of a counterweight, of allies: the Aetolian League in Greece, and the kingdom of Pergamum in Asia Minor. King Attalus, who filled this office very well, stood to gain from the alliance through the consolidation of his constantly threatened power by the prestige of Rome.³⁰ Thus jointly and severally cultivating the legend of Aeneas, Rome and Attalus were able to claim mutual kinship and to base their understanding on a community of origins which was more honorable than their community of interests. Minor but authentic facts prove that the Pergamene scholars of the end of the third century, skillful in finding great ancestors for cities and for obscure families, flattered the taste for Trojan genealogies shown by their ally the great Republic and its nobles *lineages*, and it is thought with some probability that their contemporary, the annalist Fabius Pictor, made extensive use of their inventions. The king and his successors promoted these intellectual games which served their political purposes: did not Attalus II have the story of Rhea Silvia and the Twins, the sons of Mars, portrayed among the reliefs in his mother's temple at Cyzicus?

This good understanding between the two groups of *Troiugenes* made possible a daring project: in the year 205, while Hannibal, from this time on no longer a major threat, was prolonging his precarious stay in the south of Italy, the decemvirs, asked once more to consult the Books, requested the official introduction of the cult of the Great Mother, that is, of Cybele, the Bercynthian. According to Livy (29.20.4-6), they had read in the Books an astonishingly clear *carmen*: "... if ever a foreign foe should invade the land of Italy, he could be driven out of Italy and defeated if the Idaean Mother should be brought from Pessinus to Rome." H. Graillot sums up what can be glimpsed of the intention of the decemvirs—or rather, probably of the Roman politicians whose spokesmen the decemvirs were:

30. H. Graillot, *Le culte de Cybèle, mère des dieux, à Rome et dans l'empire romain* (1912), pp. 38-43; the lines quoted later on are on pp. 43-44. On Cybele and Attis, see still H. Hepding's old book, *Attis, seine Mythen und sein Kult* (1903), and F. Bömer, "Kybele in Rom: Die Geschichte ihres Kultes als politisches Phänomen," *RM* 71 (1964): 130-51 (distinguishing Claudia Quinta from the Vestal of this name who is mentioned by Cicero). The highly important pictorial documentation is collected in M. J. Vermaseren, *The Legend of Attis in Greek and Roman Art, Etudes préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire romain*, vol. 9 (1966).

A threefold influence must have been at work on the decemvirs who were charged with examining the Books. Motivated by a religious idea, they sought the cooperation of a powerful divinity in behalf of Roman arms. Motivated by a political idea, they regarded the great Anatolian goddess as the indispensable auxiliary of senatorial diplomacy. Finally, a hidden motive of nobiliary vanity must have attracted them to the Idaean goddess. But on this occasion the pretensions of the governing aristocracy coincided with the interests of the Roman people. They became official policy, since they allowed Rome to pose shortly as the natural heiress of Asia Minor.

The *transuectio* of the Great Mother, whose anniversary was a festival day until the end of paganism, gave rise to a veritable novel, with its own variants: even in historical times, even for such a striking event, the accounts often show wide divergence in details.³¹ But the sequence of the episodes, whether believable or miraculous, is constant.³² It matters little whether the Roman emissaries, following the agreement with Attalus, had to search for the goddess as far as Pessinus, or whether they merely removed her (Varro) from the *Megalesion* of Pergamum, whether the small squadron sailing to Asia did or did not stop to consult the Delphic oracle, and whether it was this oracle or simply the decemvirs who established the formalities of reception. It is more important that the mission included three members of old patrician families and two from the plebeian nobility, and that the heroes of the Great Mother's reception were a Scipio and a Claudia: from the very beginning, the cult of the *Mater* was an aristocratic affair. Venus Erycina, at the command of the decemvirs, had seen her temple vowed and consecrated by the highest magistrate in office. In the case of the Great Mother the stipulation was a moral one: she had to be received by the best man and the most virtuous married woman. The *optimus* was P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica, a young man of twenty-eight, cousin of the most eminent general of the Republic; the *castissima* was Claudia Quinta, the daughter and the sister of recent consuls. The festival was divided between the landing port and the city. According to Livy, the married women accompanied Claudia and Scipio to Ostia. When the ship arrived off the mouth of the Tiber, Scipio boarded a small craft and

31. Examination of the variant versions of the tradition, Graillot, *Le culte de Cybèle*, pp. 25-26. See also T. Köves, "Zum Empfang der Magna Mater in Rom," *Historia* 12 (1963): 321-47.

32. Graillot, pp. 51-69.

sailed out to meet it. Aboard ship he received the black stone which represented the goddess from the hands of the Anatolian priest and priestess who had escorted it, and in his arms it reached dry land. He handed it over to the women of the highest rank, who, taking it in their turn, perhaps in a cart as the law governing sacred matters authorized them to do, conveyed it over the five leagues separating the city from the shore. Says Livy (29.14):

... The entire city poured out to meet her. Censers had been placed before the doors along the route of the bearers, and kindling their incense, people prayed that gracious and benignant she might enter the city of Rome. It was to the Temple of Victory, which is on the Palatine, that they carried the goddess on the day before the Ides of April, and that was a holy day. The people thronged to the Palatine bearing gifts for the goddess, and there was a banquet of the gods, and games also, called the Megalesia.

This triumphal march was gratuitously prettified by legend. The most remarkable alteration involves Claudia. She had been chosen as the most virtuous woman, but popular sentiment was not satisfied with this plain, unadorned selection; in a reversal of the course of cause and effect, a touching episode was invented, which was later amplified by the Augustan poets. Claudia was said not to have been chosen to welcome the goddess, because of her reputation for virtue; but the Great Mother herself, by immobilizing the ship as it was entering the Tiber, brought about Claudia's unplanned intervention, and at the same time whitened a reputation which apparently stood in some need of whitening. Says Ovid (F. 4.297-328):

The men wearied their arms by tugging lustily at the rope; hardly did the foreign ship make head against the stream. A drought had long prevailed; the grass was parched and burnt; the loaded bark sank in the muddy shallows. Every man who lent a hand toiled beyond his strength and cheered on the workers by his cries. Yet the ship stuck fast, like an island firmly fixed in the middle of the sea. Astonished at the portent, the men did stand and quake. Claudia Quinta traced her descent from Clausus of old, and her beauty matched her nobility. Chaste was she, though reputed not so. Rumour unkind had wronged her, and a false charge had been trumped up against her: it told against her that she dressed sprucely, that she walked abroad with her hair dressed in varied fashion, that she had a ready tongue for gruff old men. Conscious of her innocence, she laughed at fame's untruths; but we of the multitude are prone to think the worst. When she had stepped forth from the

procession of the chaste matrons, and taken up the pure water of the river in her hands, she thrice let it drip on her head, and thrice lifted her palms to heaven (all who looked on her thought that she was out of her mind), and bending the knee she fixed her eyes on the image of the goddess, and with dishevelled hair uttered these words: "Thou fruitful Mother of the Gods, graciously accept thy suppliant's prayers on one condition. They say I am not chaste. If thou dost condemn me, I will confess my guilt; convicted by the verdict of a goddess, I will pay the penalty with my life. But if I am free of crime, give by thine act a proof of my innocency, and, chaste as thou art, do thou yield to my chaste hands." She spoke, and drew the rope with a slight effort. . . . The goddess was moved, and followed her leader, and by following bore witness in her favour: a sound of joy was wafted to the stars.

After a temporary lodging in the temple of Victory, the goddess received her own temple on the Palatine: begun as early as 204, it was not completed and dedicated until 191. As in the case of Venus Erycina, the choice of this site is justified by the better than Roman, even pre-Roman, quality of the goddess, and these apparent derogations do not prove, as has sometimes been said, that from 217 on the rule was abandoned which relegated foreign divinities to sites outside the *pomerium*: thanks to the legend of Aeneas, neither Venus nor Cybele was a foreigner.³³

From the beginning, a priest and a priestess from Phrygia assured the service of the Great Mother. This was not the first time that a cult came in this way to Rome, with its own personnel and rites: specialists from Epidaurus had remained attached to Aesculapius and his serpent. This time, however, the orgiastic nature of the Berecynthian's cult and her noisy and frenzied troop of eunuch priests could not be brought without scandal to Rome, where castration was regarded as an outrage against the fatherland and where religion was, or tried to be, both reasoned and reasonable. Also, at the same time that the Mother of the Gods was being welcomed with such pomp, strict limitations were imposed on the practice of her religion, as if she were in herself suspect and dangerous. A series of administrative arrangements, published by the Senate, regulated her manifestations and fixed her relations with the Roman people.³⁴ She could have no more than two officiants, the priest and the priestess, assisted

33. Above, pp. 451-53.

34. Graillet, pp. 75-77.

by *famuli*, and these offices could not be held by Roman men or women or their slaves. The rites and sacrifices were rigorously confined to the interior of the temple enclosure, except on one day each year, when a procession might conduct the Black Lady to her bath in a brook close to the Porta Capena. A collection was authorized for the support of the cult and its clergy, but only on certain days, when the priests, dressed in their liturgical costume and singing and playing their instruments, could be seen stretching out their hands to the passersby. Finally, every Roman was forbidden to sacrifice to the goddess after the Anatolian rite. The official Roman cult, like the majority of the adopted Greek cults, was entrusted to the urban praetor:³⁵ in the April festivals, the sacrifice of a heifer which had never been yoked or mated, and games, which soon became an annual event (*Megale[n]sia*, *Ludi Megalenses*). In 204 sodalities of the Great Mother were formed. These were fictitious *gentes*, whose membership was drawn exclusively from the aristocracy (*nobiles*, *principes ciuitatis*); their principal function, which was surprising enough, seems to have been to honor the Great Mother with banquets, held in turn in the homes of the members and for this reason called *mutitationes*, or *dominia*.³⁶ Such sodalities were as far as the Roman tradition went in offering "freedom" of religious expression; but, sumptuous as

35. *Ibid.*, pp. 78-92.

36. So ostentatious that in 161 a *senatus consultum* set a limit on their cost, Gell. 2.24.2. Graillot, pp. 90-91: "Were [these *mutitationes*] at first as modest as Cicero has Cato the Elder describe them? In any case, there was very quickly great rivalry in sumptuousness; for the nobility it was too good an occasion to show off their luxurious tastes. The most refined dishes of Eastern cuisine were served; the rarest wines from Greece were consumed; treasures of silver plate were displayed, and masterpieces of Alexandrian art, for the possession of which wealthy Romans vied with one another. Less than half a century after their foundation, in 593-161, the Senate was obliged to vote a decree against them. The members of the sodality had to swear on oath before the consuls that they would not spend more than 120 *as* per head for each banquet, not counting the vegetables, flour, and wine; that they would drink only domestic wines; and that they would not use any silver vessel weighing more than one hundred pounds as a table setting. Like the *lex cibaria* of the consul Fannius which was promulgated in the same year, this *senatus consultum* was a triumph for the party of reaction against the moral degeneracy of the city. In fact, the conservative party, always controlled by Cato the Elder, had won over many nobles of the younger generation to its ideas. But all of the laws, sumptuary and cibarian, incessantly aggravated, abrogated, and revised, were powerless to restrain the excesses. Did the sodalities of the Great Mother, like so many other confraternities, become the breeding grounds for political agitation during the long period of the civil wars? Spared by the restrictive laws, they survived the Republic. At the beginning of the Empire the *mutitationes* of the nobles always appear on the calendar. They must have been celebrated with all the more magnificence as the Idaean goddess was particularly dear to the imperial dynasty."

these banquets were, there was nothing in them to recall the Greek *orgia*.

Thus, by the desire of the controlling aristocracy, Rome had granted citizenship to an eastern cult. What it was doubtless originally hoped would be only an exception, justified by the kinship of Rome and Phrygia, sooner or later had to serve as a precedent: under Sulla, it is the savage Cappadocian goddess Mâ, assimilated to the unfortunate Bellona, who crosses the same seas and is installed at Rome. But in 204 the outcome seemed to confirm the excellence of the religious innovation; not only was the harvest the finest in ten years, but most importantly, in the following year Hannibal left Italy for good, as the oracle had promised, and the Senate was able to close the fifteen years of anguish which the *alienigena* had cost Rome with the sacrifice of one hundred and twenty major victims and with supplications to the gods. As for the goddess, her prestige was firmly established. Thenceforth the generals would call on her in difficult undertakings and in decisive encounters. When the Near East was opened to Roman arms, some even vowed to go and sacrifice at Pessinus (Cic. *Har. resp.* 28; Val. Max. 1.1.1). This is the first manifestation of what will later form one of the temptations and one of the fears of Rome: the transfer of the seat of the empire to "Troy," or at least to the East and, as it ultimately turned out, to Byzantium, the second Rome.

8

THE FIRST LITERARY EVIDENCE

If the history of the crisis of the Second Punic War allows us to follow the regular course and the progressive widening of the official Roman religion, and also to glimpse, along with the mental exertion of its leaders, the collective emotions, panics, and enthusiasms which hastened and sometimes directed that evolution, there is another point of view from which we can regard the religious situation at Rome in this era. In fact, Roman literature now begins. In contrast with the scanty surviving scraps of Livius and Naevius, there are considerable fragments of Ennius, and we can read entire works by Plautus and Cato.¹

Ennius is an excellent witness who was involved in the military and political dramas of the time. Born in Calabria, he was twenty-two years old at the time of Trasimene, and served in the army until 204, when Cato noticed him in Sardinia and brought him to Rome. There, as a schoolmaster, he quarreled with his first patron and attacked him violently. Becoming a close friend of Scipio Africanus and Scipio Nasica, he ultimately received his just reward by being made a citizen of Rome. This Ronsard of Latin literature, like the French Ronsard, revels in the ocean of Greek poetry and thought,

1. P. Grimal, *Le siècle des Scipions* (1953). On the three authors discussed here, consult, for example, N. I. Herescu, *Bibliographie de la littérature latine* (1943). On Ennius, see especially E. M. Pease, "The Satirical Element in Ennius," *TAPhA* 27 (1896): xlviii-1; F. Marx, "De Ennii Epicharmo," *RhM* 80 (1931): 206-8; C. Brakman, "Enniana," *Mnem.* 2d ser., 60 (1932): 369-79. On Cato and Greek culture, Olga Rossi, "De Catone graecarum litterarum oppugnatore, latinitatis acerrimo defensore," *Athenaeum* (Pavia) 10 (1922): 259-73; F. Klingner, "Cato Censorius und die Krisis des römischen Volkes," *Die Antike* 10 (1934): 239-63; Poschl, "Cato als Vorbild römischer Lebenshaltung," *Neue Jahrbücher für Antike und deutsche Bildung*, 1939, pp. 411-21.

caring nothing about contradictions. A Euhemerist when he translates Euhemerus, devout and imbued with godlike majesty when he takes his inspiration from Homer, he receives, concerning the world masters, the most diverse ideas. Now he transfers Greek fable to the Roman gods whose *interpretatio graeca* is assured; and now, engaged in the national tradition, he transcribes in his verses, almost word for word, formulas of the *ius diuinum*. His Jupiter is a good example of this wealth of treatments. In the *Annales*, he is the god of the poets, of Homer:

O genitor noster Saturnie, maxime diuum . . .

However, the other half of his Capitoline title accompanies him even on Olympus:

pater optume Olimpī.

Encountering the Jupiter Feretrius of Romulus, the poet, as a good Roman, takes particular interest in the picturesque details of a ritual such as wrestling matches fought and foot races run on greased hides.

Outside of the *Annales*, in the *Epicharmus*, Jupiter is no more than a poetic name used by the philosophers to designate an element and its phenomena: the air, along with wind, clouds, rain, and cold. This new understanding of natural science, which is already finding beautiful expression in his works, combines well with religion: obviously Ennius does not sense or foresee the conflict between the national tradition and Stoic conceptions. A few noble lines saved from the wreck of the *Annales* restore the personality of the god in his full stature:

*Juppiter hic risit tempestatesque serенаe
riserunt omnes risu Jouis omnipotentis . . .*

The same contrast, and the same indifference to this contrast, appears in his treatment of other divinities. The Venus of the *Annales* is *pulcherrima diuum*, and she is included in the close-packed and weighty list of the twelve great gods, the same gods who figured in the lectisternium of 217:

*Juno Vesta Minerua Ceres Diana Venus Mars
Mercurius Joui' Neptunus Volcanus Apollo.*

However, in one of the passages of the *Euhemerus siue historia sacra*, which the Christian polemist Lactantius delighted to use as a weapon against paganism, she is no more than the founder of the *ars meretricia*: so as not to be alone in her shameless display of a liking for men, she teaches the women of Cyprus how to use their bodies for pay. But was not the same contradiction established in the public cult between Venus Erycina of the Capitol and the Venus of the Porta Collina? And did not the Greeks themselves, the interlocutors of the *Symposium*, live amid incompatible Aphrodites? We may presume that the devotion of the poet to the mother of the Aeneades was in no way clouded by the suggestions of Euhemerus concerning the courtesan of Cyprus, and we can see how the keenest Roman intellects were boldly casting into the difficulties and contradictions in which the inhabitants of the other side of the Adriatic had already delighted for so long a time.

Plautus, who was older than Ennius, never escaped from the lowly circumstances of his birth, but in his own way he participated in the events of his time: one of the few plays by him which can be dated, the *Pseudolus*, was performed in 191, on the occasion of the dedication of the Great Mother's temple. It is generally admitted that his plays were composed between 213 and 185, and his *Poenulus* amused its audiences by its presentation on the stage of an almost true-to-life Carthaginian babbling a kind of gibberish. As for religion, Plautus too, in his own fashion and within the limits of his literary genre, carelessly and happily mingles the Greek atmosphere of the models which he is adapting with his own experience as a Roman artisan. The Mercury of the *Amphitruo* is typical in this respect: appearing as a family slave in the prologue, like the Lar of the *Aulularia*, he introduces himself to the spectators in the character which in fact always belonged to the Roman god of the *mercatores*; then in the same tone he explains his mythologic status and his mission in the play. Perhaps, accustomed as we are to this transfer from Olympus onto the Capitol—a practice in which there was in those days at least a degree of freshness, if not of novelty—we cannot fully appreciate this wise guy when he says, *ego qui Jouis sum filius*, or when he plays skillfully on the stage Jupiter and the god Jupiter, soliciting the good will of the audience for his father and for himself.

I come at the command of Jupiter, and my name is Mercury. The reason my father has sent me here is to ask a favor of you. Of course, he's perfectly aware that you'll take whatever he tells you as an order, since he knows you fear and respect the name of Jupiter, as you should. Nevertheless, he specifically instructed me to put this to you in nice, polite language . . .²

M. Porcius Cato, *Cato Maior*, presents another picture. Born in Tusculum in 234, of an obscure family, he distinguishes himself as a soldier and as a magistrate. Energetic and brave, obstinate and miserly, ardently patriotic and coldly insensitive, he deserves to stand as the very type of the ancient Roman. His hatred for the defeated and harmless Carthage and his unfeeling contempt for his flock of slaves indicate the narrow measure of his humanity, but the services which he rendered to the state and to public morality are indisputable. On forty-four separate occasions he successfully refuted the accusations of adversaries who were as impassioned as he and less purely motivated—a performance without parallel at Rome. Literarily, his memory is done a disservice by what survives of his work: the treatise on agriculture, a collection of short, precise notes, magic recipes, and shrewd counsels, is valuable only to the historian. The religion which is revealed there is that of the farmer, the small landholder like Cato on his property in the Sabine countryside. Thanks to him, we know a few rituals and some interesting groupings of gods which are in the purest Roman tradition; the foreign elements in this treatise are insignificant. His work in seven books on the *Origins of the Roman People* has not survived; the quotations from it which the ancients give suggest that it is a great loss, and that it contained a large number of specific details concerning the public religion. He was the enemy of innovations and innovators, and suspicious of anything coming from Greece, and everything inclines us to the belief that his personal religion and that which he was

2. I do not at all believe that Plautus gives evidence (in the prologue of the *Rudens*) of a moral "transformation" of religion; it is impossible to admit what A. Grenier writes, *Le génie romain dans la religion, la pensée et l'art* (1925), pp. 197-98: "Tragedy certainly contributed to the adoption of the Greek gods. The more popular comedy must have had an even greater effect, but in another domain; it established a connection between the gods and morality which had not existed until then. The prologue of the *Rudens* seems to us to be characteristic in this respect. Jupiter becomes the judge and the protector of virtue." No. It is possible that the content of ideas such as "virtue," "good," etc., may have changed; but Jupiter was certainly never uninterested in these things.

determined to defend were scarcely touched by the great movements of the period. And yet, when he was about thirty years old he took his first lessons in Greek from Ennius, and he seems to have mastered that language. However, what he took from Greece, late in life and for his personal use, was not religious in substance, but strictly philosophical. When one remembers this Roman's Greek teachers, it is difficult to understand such a strict separation of these two categories of thought. But the traditional Roman gods did not have the explanatory and cosmic range of the Greek gods: they protected the life of the city through specific orders, some continuously valid, others circumstantial, with no doctrine of the whole to coordinate all this. As we have seen, it had probably been otherwise in the beginning, but for a long time the Indo-European "philosophy" which had sustained the Jupiter-Mars-Quirinus triad at the center of Roman religion and the memory of which had not been forgotten—the story of the ox and horse "heads," Carthage's *omina*, proves this—had lost its importance, and it had not been replaced. Moreover, as we have also seen, in response to questions of individual religion which bordered on philosophy, questions involving the soul and the fate of man after death, the tradition offered only summary or confused representations. As *pater familias* or as citizen, the Roman knew exactly what he had to do, and, in surrendering to his executioners, Regulus was thinking only of Rome, not of the hereafter. Greece revealed other needs to Roman minds, even the most stubborn: inner contemplation, the dialogue with oneself, the inclination for closer, more trusting, more loving relations with some of the gods. At the same time, through her science and through her doctrines concerning nature, she raised other problems: the origin of the world, the relations between gods and things, whether immanent or transcendent, and also, in a new form, the relations of the gods among themselves, the very essence of the divine: was their pluralism real or apparent? By not making allowance for these problems, the traditional Roman religion left the Catos as well as the Scipios, the strict as well as the flexible, free to inquire elsewhere, from whatever new sources they could find. Thus a compartmentalization between a basically cultic religion and philosophical speculation seemed possible.

To be sure, the risks were obvious: philosophers are ambitious, they explain everything, and whether critics or dogmatists, they

penetrate into every phase of existence; moreover, there are some methods of formulating the relationship between gods and things that usually end up by denying the gods. A literary man like Ennius, fickle and changeable, could delight in revealing the discoveries of Euhemerus. A Cato, who regarded himself as largely responsible for the preservation of Rome, could not do this; and so he took an active part in expelling from Rome Carneades and the other philosophers whose lectures the young Romans had been eagerly following. But, within the limits of the "open questions," he did not scruple to pursue his inquiries. In 209 at Tarentum, accompanying Q. Maximus, he had been billeted in the house of the Pythagorean philosopher Nearchus and had become acquainted with a treatise by Archytas. It may be imagined that at the age of twenty-five he was not insensitive to these intellectual allurements, and that the profession of Pythagoreanism which he made in his old age had been in constant preparation throughout his life, sustained by the vivid memory of this early experience. At any rate, Cato the Elder's great posthumous good fortune in being chosen by Cicero to preach the most comforting ideas of Pythagoreanism would not have been possible if it had not been common knowledge that the famous censor actually did sustain his last years with this philosophy. In a chapter of this *De senectute* (11.38), Cato himself, at the age of eighty-four, describes his vigorous intellectual activity:

... I am now at work on the seventh volume of my *Antiquities*. I am collecting all the records of our ancient history, and at the present moment am revising all the speeches made by me in the notable causes which I conducted. I am investigating the augural, pontifical, and secular law; I also devote much of my time to Greek literature; and, in order to exercise my memory, I follow the practice of the Pythagoreans and run over in my mind every evening all that I have said, heard, or done during the day.

Here we see the dividing line between Rome's civil and religious tradition, which merely has to be recorded and maintained, and the living, and at the same time utilitarian, practice of one of the philosophies of Greece. The same division appears in the admirable peroration, between the Roman instinct and the teachings of the wise men of Tarentum and from across the sea; this time, however, there is a happy convergence of the two: why should I fear death, when Plato,

Xenophon, and the Pythagoreans have given such good reasons for belief in the immortality of the soul? Why should I, an old man, be afraid of it, when so many times—*quod scripsi in Originibus*—the young men of our legions have left *alacri animo et erecto* for places from which they knew they would never return alive? Happy man, or poor man, who could so serenely and unconcernedly link together two ways of thought which were destined to be more daringly and more fruitfully mingled in the centuries to come!

IDEOLOGICAL INNOVATIONS

Beyond the individual combinations and juxtapositions of Roman tradition and Greek thought, of which Ennius and Cato give the first preserved examples, this mixture of two civilizations, this encounter of Rome's unprecedented growth with Greece's magnificent spiritual and intellectual structures, provided public religion with new insights, rejuvenated or transformed several old guiding ideas, and planted the seed of conceptions which were not to develop until much later, but which were then called upon to effect a veritable metamorphosis.

One of these rejuvenations concerns the notion of destiny. As I have said several times, the idea of a long-range destiny, of the predestination of men and of societies, even of Roman society, does not seem to have been held or expressed in the archaic religion. Such an idea could hardly find expression in an outlook which was wholly directed toward the concrete and the immediate, and which was as little interested in the depths of time as in the immensities of space. The life of the Romans and of Rome was framed by modest and solid categories, by days, months, and years; it was basically regulated by the calendar. Beyond that the *lustrum* played an important but limited role, and the *saeculum* was still an idea as vague, as unstable, as are the generations of man. In the life of the state, after the coming-of-age of the Republic, the basic unit was the year; through the annual renewal of the great magistracies, it effectively called everything in question, including the immediate intentions of the gods toward Rome. In the regal period, the division by years could not play such a large part, but at the start of each reign, with the *inauguratio* of the

king, the gods certainly manifested their feelings and their wishes, and they probably expressed themselves on plenty of other occasions.

The essential element in the relations of the gods to man consisted of signs and the interpretation of these signs, some periodic and regular and others fortuitous, some solicited and others imposed: *auspicia*, *auguria*, *omina*, *prodigia*. Some of these were equivalent to permits, or even guides; others were warnings, signs of disagreement or anger, announcements of danger. Thanks to these multiple indications, the magistrates in their posts and individuals in the performance of their religious tasks behaved as it were experimentally, ever on the alert to recognize an error in procedure and to request new advice. Interpretation played a large part, especially in the *omina*, which it was lawful either to accept or to reject, and in normal times the techniques of *procuratio* were adequate to cope with prodigies.¹ It remains nonetheless true that *auspicia* and *auguria* generally gave clear enough expressions of the will of the gods, and primarily of Jupiter. But they did so only for a limited time, for a specific decision such as undertakings involving peace or war.²

In addition to these signs from the gods, Rome had promises of permanence, of which at least two are certainly very old: the perpetual fire maintained by the Vestals and, in Jupiter's immediate entourage, the goddess Juventas. As we have seen, Juventas is simultaneously the patroness of the *iuvenes* and of the vital force which they bear within themselves and which gave them their name; Rome's permanence is in fact conceived concretely as the succession of young men which keeps her young in a kind of perpetual and predictable unrolling. When the legend of the origins began to be codified, a literary reinforcement was added to these pledges. Jupiter had concluded a pact with Romulus, and the function of the twelve vultures seen by the rex-augur was not only to approve the foundation which he was planning and to designate him, rather than Remus, as the founder, but to guarantee the city which he was about to found

1. Above, p. 120, and below, pp. 600-606.

2. Catalano, *DA*, pp. 42, 54, 322, maintains that in contrast with the *auspicia*, only the *auguria* could be valid for an unlimited period (foundations of cities, etc.). I do not think this is true: speaking of the birds seen by Romulus, Florus 1.4 uses the verb *auspicari* and the substantive *augurium* within a few lines; Livy uses *augurium* (1.7.1) and Virgil *auspica* (*Aen.* 6.781) for the original auspices taken by Romulus. See A. Magdelain, *Recherches sur l' "imperium," la loi curiate, et les auspices d'investiture* (1968), pp. 67-72.

and its survival beyond Romulus himself, beyond the first generation. When his military and political successes raised Rome's hopes and ambitions, the growing legend furnished him with promises not only of permanence but of power: such was the meaning inherent in Jupiter's initial promise to Romulus, as it is magnificently voiced by Virgil's Anchises (*Aen.* 6.782-83), and as it was undoubtedly conceived by the *patres* of the third century:

Behold, my son, the man through whose auspices renowned Rome shall match her *imperium* with the world and raise men's hearts to the heaven of the gods.

Similarly, the *ancilia* of the Salii, originally talismans for annual use, later received their imperial significance, and the *caput humanum*, derived from the name of the Capitol which it claimed to explain, was regarded as having promised to Rome and denied to Etruria domination over Italy, and later over the world.

But all this is far removed from the idea of destiny, an idea which is, as we know, confused and filled with contradictions, even among the most fatalistic peoples, since it clashes both with the idea of the power of the gods or of God and with our experience of freedom, and because, understood in all its rigor, it would reduce life to a mere puppet show—a conception which most humans are unwilling to accept.³ What *Juventas*, *Vesta*, and Jupiter originally guaranteed to Rome was permanence, an open permanence with no specific events and conditional only on Rome's fidelity to their cult. As for the rest, it was a matter of circumstances, and those responsible for the city's welfare could always negotiate with the god, as the Numa of the legend did, and as the Senate and pontiffs, under the threat posed by Hannibal, obstinately and repeatedly did.

The Etruscans had a theory of destiny, complicated and already strongly influenced by Greek representations, which seems to have helped them to accept their own defeat and the triumph of Rome. What became of this theory on the banks of the Tiber? Probably a few speculations among the pontiffs and augurs, but nothing to

3. See especially the fine analyses by H. Ringgren, *Studies in Arabian Fatalism* (1955); cf. the same author's *Fatalism in Persian Epics* (1952). For Rome and Etruria, see R. Bloch, "Liberté et déterminisme dans la divination romaine," *Coll. Lat.* 70 (*Hommages à Jean Bayet*) (1964): 89-100; "Liberté et déterminisme dans la divination étrusque," *Studi in onore di Luisa Banti* (1965), pp. 63-68.

produce any change or innovation in rites or doctrine. It was the structure of the months as such that was borrowed from Etruria, rather than any vaster framework, and this structure was filled out with almost exclusively Roman festivals. Did the war with Veii give life to these speculations, as Rome saw herself becoming the heiress of Etruria and as Etruria resigned herself to decay? Yes, if epic poetry is to be believed. But this epic, highly constructed like the whole of Camillus's biography, is probably quite different from the actual events which gave rise to it, and in any case bears the mark of appreciably more recent conceptions.

It was certainly through Greece, through the religion and literature of Greece, at the end of the fourth century and throughout the whole of the third, that the Romans entered into possession of this new realm of thought and became familiar with its grand perspectives. It was probably at this time that the Books which the decemvirs had been consulting for years in order to conjure away threatening omens came to be called "Sibylline." Up to then they must have been only a collection of mainly Etrusco-Roman formulas, having no connection with the eras and stages of the future.⁴ As the prestige of Hellenism waxed and that of Etruria waned, Apollo and the Cumaeen Sibyl became involved in the matter, and the Books, enlarged by Greek wisdom and by vast claims, fully realized their other name, *libri fatales*.

In what era did *fatum*, *fata* take on the meaning of *εἰμαρμένη*? The word is an old one, but probably for a long time it referred only to the formulated decisions of the gods, just as *numen*, *numina* referred only to their acquiescence or approval. The two oldest examples we have which connect the verb *fari* with the idea of destiny occur in the *Odisia* of Livius Andronicus and the *Annales* of Ennius. The former, who writes Latin but thinks Greek, equates the ancient and obscure divinities of birth, the Parcae,⁵ one of whom he names, with the Moirai (in Gell. 3.16.11):

quando dies adueniet, quem profata Morta est . . .

4. Above, pp. 441-42; below, pp. 601-2.

5. Shortly after the end of World War II, at Tor Tignosa, near the ancient Lavinium, three cippi were unearthed, dating from the end of the fourth century or the beginning of the third, and bearing the inscriptions: *neuna fata, neuna dono, parca maurtia dono*. Two of the Parcae of Rome, *Nona* and *Morta*, were recognized, in curiously diphthongized forms. The epithet *Fata* seems to indicate that already at this time, in Lavinium, these characters were

Ennius uses the substantive *fata*, though unfortunately in a rather uncertain context. Probably his presentation of Anchises should be read as follows:

*doctusque Anchisa, Venus quem pulcherrima dea
diuum fata docet, diuinum ut pectus haberet.*

This passage, which is also thoroughly Greek, attests that in this matter of destiny too the legend of Aeneas played a part in acclimatizing a concept of Greek epic poetry at Rome. Later, Virgil shows in the second half of the *Aeneid* that the settlement of the Trojans in Italy was brought about by the conjunction of three *fata*: the *fatum* which the pious Aeneas, son of Venus and sovereign-designate, gradually and painfully discovers to be his own calling; the *fatum* of the Etruscan warriors, who have received word that they will come under a foreign command; and the *fatum* of the wealthy Latinus, who has been instructed to wed his daughter only to a foreigner. This seems to be a transparent adaptation of the legend of Romulus, which gave Rome three component parts: the companions of the *rex-augur*, the warlike band of the Etruscan Lucumon, and the wealthy Sabines.⁶ Nevertheless, the career of Aeneas could only be regarded as an epic of destiny and providence. Was it not for the purpose of a true rebirth that this hero, miraculously escaping from the sack of Troy, and bearing the traditions and talismans of his fatherland, was led by the gods to Latium? What other meaning could have been assigned to this colonization, in the light of Rome's spectacular growth? In fact, as we have seen, at the beginning of his *Bellum Poenicum* Naevius prepares the way for a noble scene in the *Aeneid* by showing Venus as a suppliant at the feet of Jupiter, and Jupiter reassuring her with his promise of Rome's future greatness: *et sequuntur*, says Macrobius in his précis of the text (6.2.31), *uerba Iouis filiam consolantis spe*

linked with destiny, and it is likely that this promotion was made at Lavinium. Greek influence is undoubted: the *Lar Aeneas* (above, p. 453) appears in the same group of discoveries. See the already considerable bibliography in the second part of Mme L. L. Tels-de Jong's book, *Sur quelques divinités romaines de la naissance et de la prophétie* (1959), pp. 67-130 (*Parca, Parcae*; the word *fatum*; *tria fata*; *Nundina, Nona, Neuna, Neuna fata*; *fata scribunda*). (On *Morta* (pp. 70-77, 83-85), see also P. Ramat, *Archivio glottologico italiano* 40 (1960): 61-67, and J. H. Waszink, *Gnomon* 34 (1962): 445. For *Fata scribunda*, see S. Breemer and J. H. Waszink, *Mnem.* 3d ser., 13 (1947): 254-70 (she is supposed to be personal destiny, connected with giving a name to the child at the *dies lustricus*). P. Boyancé, *La religion de Virgile* (1963), has devoted an important chapter to the idea of *fatum*, pp. 39-57.

6. That is the subject of *ME* 1, pt. II, chap. 4 ("Un dessein de Virgile"), pp. 337-422.

futurorum. Virgil will set down these *uerba Jouis* fully and clearly (I.257-58):

*Parce metu, Cytherea, manent immota tuorum
fata tibi . . .*

*. . . fabor enim, quando haec te cura remordet
longius et uoluens fatorum arcana mouebo . . .*

To Rome's yearly existence, to these "mountains of almanacs," in the picturesque expression of Louis Havet, which were piled up by the first annalists for the use of their successors, the legend of Aeneas gave not only a valuable extension into the Greek past but a transcendent meaning. Astonished and flattered, Rome perceived that she was the end-product of a long providential preparation, and that not only Romulus, but Brutus, Camillus, and Manlius, and after them Fabius, Aemilius Paullus, and Scipio had been and were the instruments foreseen from the very beginning for the realization of this work. From this idea everything took on a new meaning, the defeats as well as the victories, the legions and their leaders. When Livy, in his fifth book, called Camillus *fatalis dux*, he was probably committing one of those anachronisms with which the epic of Veii is filled; but in the twenty-sixth, when he calls the future conqueror of Hannibal, the first Scipio, by the same name, he is speaking a language which would surely be understood by that hero's contemporaries.

This brilliant *fatum* coming from Greece seems to have buried, to have muffled for a long time, but not to have destroyed other reflections concerning the *dies natalis* and the horoscope of Rome, some Etruscan in style and probably in origin, others evolved by the augural college. These reflections interested Varro greatly, and later provided the subject matter for one of Salomon Reinach's most provocative essays⁷ and for the multiple researches of Jean Hubaux.⁸ Here is the "problem of the vultures" in the elegant presentation of the Belgian scholar:

Neither the vultures, nor their manner of flying, nor the region of the sky in which they appeared gave rise to such important reflections as their number:

7. "Une prédiction accomplie," *Cultes, mythes et religions* 3 (1908): 302-10.

8. Notably *Les grands mythes de Rome* (1945), chaps 1 and 2 ("Romulus et l'horoscope de Rome"; "Le premier terme assigné à Rome est franchi"). The passage quoted here is on pp. 4-6.

there were twelve of them. The soberest minds of Rome attributed the highest significance to this fact. Here is what the learned Varro reported in his *Antiquitates*: a Roman named Vettius who had made a name for himself in the augural art had developed a theory concerning the twelve vultures of Romulus which had strongly impressed Varro. This theory stated that if we are to believe the traditions handed down to us by the historians regarding the augural signs which marked the foundation of Rome, we know that twelve vultures were involved. Now more than one hundred and twenty years have elapsed since that event, and the Roman people are still alive and flourishing. It therefore follows that our nation will endure for twelve hundred years.

To establish his calculations the erudite augur took his point of departure from a fact which he seems to have found in the earlier historians, namely, that the *omen* of the twelve vultures applied not only to the founder but to the city which he was founding. The relationship thus established between the vultures and the city was one of duration, and from that time on the number twelve became the chief element of the *omen*. It meant that Rome was to endure for a period twelve times as long as some unspecified unit of time.

Since heaven was also involved in this, it could not be a question of twelve months or of one year multiplied by twelve. . . . The learned Vettius seems to have admitted that by granting to Rome an existence of one decade multiplied by twelve, destiny would have correctly fulfilled its obligation to the founder. But, thanks to the intervention of the gods, this period of one hundred and twenty years had long since expired; from then on, the unknown factor in the problem raised by the vultures was not the decade: it was the century. Rome was to endure for twelve centuries, and this prospect was either very reassuring or, on the contrary, almost disturbing, depending on differences of temperament.

In fact, Rome died, or was able to think that she was dying, at the hands of Alaric in the year 410 of the Christian era, thus in the middle of the twelfth century of her official existence, and in the decades which preceded the catastrophe the ancient theory of the augur Vettius contributed not a little to the demoralization of the Romans:⁹ with each alarm, with each defeat, with each prodigy, the twelve vultures of Romulus were remembered, and the promise which was completing its long period and was turning into a threat. Claudian portrays the Romans, who were still under the protection of Stilicho, as abandoning themselves to defeatism, and even shortening the

9. Hubaux, pp. 151-55.

reckoning which dooms them when the prophetic twelfth century has only just begun (*B. Get.* 1.265-66):

*tunc reputant annos, interceptoque uolatu
uulturis, incidunt properatis saecula metis . . .*

This seems to mean: "Presently, the years which have elapsed are counted, and, by intercepting the flight of one (of the twelve) vulture(s), Rome's centuries are cut short, and the end of her career is hastened." At the time of Cannae and Zama, and for some generations thereafter, these things were only the games of specialists: the *fatum* which came to maturity and which thrust itself upon the minds of the Romans was the one of which Aeneas had been the agent, before Romulus, and which was open to the future, admitting no limits.

The heroic years which closed the third century saw the ripening of another conception full of promise: that of intimate ties between a divinity and a man, extending even as far as kinship.¹⁰ Until then no Roman had claimed such familiarities or had such pretensions. The *gentes* who were specially entrusted with a cult or traditionally attached to a cult maintained the cool and respectful attitude toward "their" god which characterized public religion. Egeria advising Numa, Hercules winning a beautiful courtesan at dice and paying for her favors by providing her with a wealthy old or young lover—these are only characters in late legends, obviously inspired by Greece. In all respects the Roman keeps his distance from the divine: when Camillus appears in a triumphal procession riding in a chariot drawn by white horses, he is reproached for usurping the team of Jupiter or of the sun. By endowing the gods with bodies as represented in beautiful statues, by attributing to them the adventures, passions, and weaknesses accumulated in an inexhaustible mythology, Hellenism changed this whole attitude. The gods finally had a life worth living, a normal life, with family trees, marriages, and adulteries. The Hercules associated with Juventas in the prayers of 218 was surely Herakles, the husband of Hebe. Jupiter and Juno were no longer only associates, but the royal pair of Olympus, and the principal gods were their sons and daughters. But Greece supplied not only gods; she also had demigods, among whom was Herakles, the

10. C. Koch, "Gottheit und Mensch im Wandel der römischen Staatsform," in *Religio* (1960), pp. 94-113.

son of Zeus and a mortal woman. Very early, by the fourth century at the latest, Rome acquired one of these valuable products of cross-breeding in the person of her founder; at least she specified the still obscure idea of the superhuman founder in terms of semi-divinity. However, his was a special case, surrounded by legend, and it did not form a precedent.

The naturalization of the legend of Aeneas gave impetus to this conception of the demigod and provided it with new fortunes. Romulus had had no children, and thus no Roman *gens* could claim descent, through Romulus, from Mars, who was only the putative and political father of the Romans. On the other hand, Aeneas, the son of Venus and Anchises, had a son, Ascanius, whom a new name, Iulus, was soon to make the *auctor* of a rising *gens*, the Julii, not to mention the followers of Aeneas from whom several families claimed descent in their feverish quest for great ancestors.

The evolution of this concept was also hastened by the Punic crisis. Henceforth almost all the great men of Rome will have a high-ranking god or goddess as their chosen protector, and several will not be afraid to say or let it be said that they were born of a god. Of these, the first in time, long before Augustus, the son of Apollo, was Scipio, who claimed Jupiter himself as his father—which enabled him to appear to the Romans as the western version of the fabulous Alexander. Livy, who admires Scipio unreservedly, is irritated by this mythic element: are not his hero's qualities sufficient in themselves to explain his successes? But he has to mention it, since it contributed to the esteem which Scipio, while still quite young, enjoyed among the Romans. At the age of twenty-four, by the unanimous vote of the centuries, Scipio received the command of the army in Spain; however, with the passing of their first enthusiasm, those who had elected him began to be disturbed by his youth and by the misfortunes which had recently befallen his family in Spain itself. Then (26.19.1-8) he called the people together and addressed them in such lofty and magnanimous terms that, according to the historian, "he filled everybody with a more confident hope than is usually inspired by trust in a mere human promise," *certiores spei quam quantam fides promissi humani subiicere solet*.¹¹

11. Cf. Gell. 6.1.6: miraculous accounts concerning P. Scipio, the first Africanus, *ex annalibus sumpta*; J. Aymard, "Scipion l'Africain et les chiens du Capitole," *REL* 31 (1953): 111-16.

... For Scipio was remarkable not only for his real abilities, but thanks to a certain skill also had from his youth adapted himself to their display, doing most of his actions before the public either as if they were prompted by visions in the night or inspired by the gods, whether because he also was possessed by a certain superstition, or in order that men might carry out without hesitation his commands and advice, as though emanating from an oracular response. More than that, preparing men's minds from the very beginning, from the time when he put on the manly gown, there was not a day on which he did any business public or private without going first to the Capitol, and after he had entered the temple, sitting down and usually passing the time there alone in seclusion. This custom, which he maintained throughout his lifetime, confirmed in some men the belief, whether deliberately circulated or by chance, that he was a man of divine race [*stirpis eum diuinæ uirum esse*]. And it revived the tale previously told of Alexander the Great and rivalling it as unfounded gossip, that his conception was due to an immense serpent, and that the form of the strange creature had very often been seen in his mother's chamber, and that, when persons came in, it had suddenly glided away and disappeared from sight. He himself never made light of men's belief in these marvels; on the contrary it was rather promoted by a certain studied practice of neither denying such a thing nor openly asserting it.

Livy is reluctant to suggest the obvious conclusion, that this snake was the Capitoline god himself; but it is part of the tradition. Silius Italicus (13.400-413) makes the hero meet his mother, Pomponia, in the underworld. She "reveals to him his glorious origin, so that in the future he will not fear any war, nor hesitate to raise himself to heaven through his exploits":

... It chanced that I was alone at midday, enjoying the sleep that my weariness required, when suddenly I was clasped in an embrace—no common and familiar union, as when my husband came to me; and then in radiant light, though my half-closed eyes were full of sleep, I saw—doubt me not—I saw Jupiter! Nor was I deceived by the god's disguise; for he had changed himself into a serpent covered with scales and drew his coils after him in huge curves. But I was not permitted to live on after my delivery. What grief was mine, that my spirit departed before I could tell you these things!

Jean Hubaux (p. 82) has an ingenious theory which brings in an unexpected witness at this point—Plautus:

If Livy is telling the truth when he writes that while Scipio himself was still alive the story was told that his mother had conceived him through

the efforts of Jupiter, we may wonder if the *Amphitruo* of Plautus was not a comedy based on actual events. The play, which is as amusing as can be, and unique of its kind in the whole of Roman theater, presents the metamorphoses of Jupiter, who has assumed the features of Amphitryon in order to seduce the latter's wife, Alcmena. . . . How pointed these lines become if they are addressed to an audience which knows, in Rome itself, a man whom his adulators call the son of Jupiter, born of a mortal mother and a divine father!

With this clever demigod, Rome also sketched another type of man, a kind of godlike mortal, one who deserves to be a god and who ends up by becoming, if not a god, at least something akin to divinity. This summons of "heaven" is made plain in the four lines attributed to Ennius and preserved by Cicero, Seneca, and Lactantius, in which Scipio himself is supposed to say that if others than he can rise to the abode of the gods, it is for him alone that the greatest gate will be opened.¹² In the *Dream of Scipio* (Aemilianus) which ends the *De Republica*, Cicero has made the first Scipio Africanus the spokesman of a noble doctrine (6.13):¹³

But, Africanus, be assured of this, so that you may be even more eager to defend the commonwealth: all those who have preserved, aided, or enlarged their fatherland have a special place prepared for them in the heavens, where they may enjoy an eternal life of happiness. For nothing of all that is done on earth is more pleasing to that supreme God who rules the whole universe than the assemblies and gatherings of men associated in justice, which are called States. Their rulers and preservers come from that place, and to that place they return.

Thus the last orator and philosopher of the Roman Republic reconciled two enemies, the Cato of the *De senectute* and the Scipio of the *Somnium*, in two eloquent and serene affirmations of the immortality of the soul and the heavenly reward promised to great citizens. If these ideas did not spring from the official religion, they were easily accommodated by it, and probably Scipio and Cato actually professed them.¹⁴ They matured quickly: the time was not

12. Hubaux, p. 81.

13. See P. Boyancé, *Etudes sur le Songe de Scipion* (1936), p. 21, with the commentary, pp. 138-46: Platonic ideas assimilated, to be sure, but "there is nothing more Roman in the *Dream*."

14. G. Maurach, "Africanus Maior und die Glaubwürdigkeit des *Somnium Scipionis*," *Hermes* 92 (1964): 299-313.

far off when Caesar, the grandson of Venus, was to be promoted to godhead among the stars, thus opening the way for so many "divine" emperors.¹⁵

Finally, the events of the fourth and third centuries not only brought about a material change in Rome but also transformed her image in the minds of her children and of the other Italic peoples, while the outcome of the Second Punic War promised even greater metamorphoses for her.¹⁶ Through the events of history and through the legend of Aeneas, she receives a providential role. Her *maiestas* is still envied and defied, but it is no longer disputed. The loyalty of the greater part of her allies during the times of trial is complete. In an impatient moment, on the very eve of revolt, the Latins and Campanians can think at first of no other demand than to seek a halfway admittance to the Roman Senate, and to provide Rome with one of her two consuls. The Social War of the second century, even though it is quickly oriented toward secession and aims at the supplanting of Rome, is originally caused by the disappointed ambitions of certain cities and certain peoples to be the equals of Rome in the Roman empire. This advancement could not be without consequences in theology. To be sure, we are far from the moment when the goddess Rome will come forward for the adoration of the world, but she is acquiring a personality, she is becoming an entity, she is receiving a *Genius*, for, as we have seen,¹⁷ the *Genius* named for the first time in the religious actions after Trebia can only be that of the Roman people as a whole, *Genius publicus*, or *Genius populi Romani*. And it is probably around this time that the incoherent speculations concerning the secret name of Rome and the guardian divinity who is so

15. On the preparation for the charismas of the emperors in the first century B.C., see F. Taeger, *Charisma: Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Herrscherkultus* 2 (1960), the first chapter ("Voraussetzungen und Vorstufen").

16. C. Koch, "Roma aeterna" (1949), reprinted in the collection *Religio* (1960), pp. 142-75; V. Buchheit, *Vergil über die Sendung Roms, Untersuchungen zum Bellum Poenicum und zur Aeneis, Beihefte zum "Gymnasium"* 3 (1963); cf. J. Vogt, *Ciceros Glaube an Rom* (1935); for the later times, O. Seel, *Römische Denker und römischer Staat, Neue Wege zur Antike*, 1st ser. (Darstellungen), 13 (1937); F. Christ, *Die römische Weltherrschaft in der antiken Dichtung* (1938), *Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft* 31. For the figuration of Rome on the oldest coins, see Mattingly, *RC*, pp. 50, 51, 52, and pl. XIV 13-17 (from 195 to 43 B.C.): "Rome is clearly distinguished by a special Phrygian helmet (the Trojan legend!) from Minerva."

17. Above, pp. 460-61.

intimately involved with her that the two are confounded with each other, become more numerous and specific.¹⁸

But there is another sense in which the "fact" of Rome entered into religion at that time. At the very moment when the discovery of the rich assortment of Greek philosophies brings skepticism and irreligion to Rome, when Ennius translates Euhemerus, unconsciously preparing the way for Carneades, the difficult but stunning success of the war against Hannibal has proved on the contrary, not by reasoning, but by a kind of properly executed and patiently followed-up laboratory experiment, that the gods do indeed exist, and that the traditional techniques which allow men to know their will, interpret their signs, respond to their desires, and appease their wrath are correct and effective. In each circumstance it is enough to discover the god, or gods, whom it is appropriate to honor and the forms of worship which they desire. And it is truly a question involving Roman gods, because Venus Erycina and the Great Mother are summoned not as foreigners but as goddesses who were Romans before there was a Rome, long neglected through ignorance and now happily found again. To sum up, from here on the best proof of the existence of the gods is Rome herself, her past, her present, and the good fortune which the future obviously has in store for her. Thus a decisive answer is provided to the subtleties and syllogisms of the logicians. The religious restoration by Augustus is solidly based on this common-sense idea. Before him, in the curious treatise in which Cicero reveals through his characters the various views concerning the nature of the gods by which he himself is tempted, the wise pontiff, C. Cotta, uses this answer to refute the arguments of the Stoic philosopher Balbus (*Nat. d.* 3.2):

... I [must] uphold the beliefs about the immortal gods which have come down to us from our ancestors, and the rites and ceremonies and duties of religion. For my part I always shall uphold them and always have done so, and no eloquence of anybody, learned or unlearned, shall ever dislodge me from the belief as to the worship of the immortal gods which I have inherited

18. We cannot determine the time when the conception of the "geheime Schutzgott-heit von Rom" (Brelich, 1949) was formed. Latte, p. 125, n. 2, with a false reference ("JRS 40 [1950]: 140"), notes that S. Weinstock believes he can see an eastern influence and does not think it to be earlier than the first century; this is unnecessarily skeptical: the link between this conception and the risks of the old operation of *evocatio* cannot be done away with and is evidence of a greater antiquity.

from our forefathers. On any question of religion I am guided by the high pontiffs, Tib. Coruncanius, P. Scipio and P. Scaevola, not by Zeno or Cleanthes or Chrysippus; and I have C. Laelius, who was both an augur and a philosopher, to whose discourse upon religion, in his famous oration, I would rather listen than to any leader of the Stoics. The religion of the Roman people comprises ritual, auspices, and the third additional division consisting of all such prophetic warnings as the interpreters of the Sibyl or the soothsayers have derived from portents and prodigies. Well, I have always thought that none of these departments of religion was to be despised, and I have held the conviction that Romulus by his auspices and Numa by his establishment of our ritual laid the foundations of our state, which assuredly could never have been as great as it is had not the fullest measure of divine favour been obtained for it.

Thus, in full payment of her debt, Rome becomes the warrant, the living proof, and the permanent *auctor* of the gods who have protected her and of the cult which allowed this protection. Is it not this certainty which sustains the ponderous, technically accomplished, and beautiful lines, in which Ennius describes the taking of the first auspices, the rivalry of Remus and Romulus, and Jupiter's choice (Cic. *Diu.* I.107):

*Cum cura magna curantes tum cupientes -
regni dant operam simul auspicio augurioque*
...
... *simul aureus exoritur sol,
cedunt de caelo ter quatuor corpora sancta
auium, praepetibus sese pulchrisque locis dant.
Conspicit inde sibi data Romulus esse priora,
auspicio regni stabilita scamna solumque.*

For Romulus and his ambition are not alone at stake; another great line by Ennius gives the true range and import of the event:

Augusto augurio postquam inclita condita Roma est.

Augusto augurio is not, as Hubaux believed, a kind of pun: the growth, or no doubt rather the fullness, the "full strength" acquired by growth, which the neuter **auges-* seems originally to have designated,¹⁹ is the very reason for the *augurium*. Octavius, in his restoration of Romulus's work, will revive the word with its full weight of tradition and promise.

19. Above, pp. 118-19.

As for the *Genius publicus* who has just made a discreet entrance into the liturgical schedule of 218, it is moving to encounter him again, very much later, at the bedside of another emperor, the last great pagan, Julian the Apostate.²⁰ Julian was conducting his final war in Persia. One peaceful night, as he was sleeping in his tent, the *Genius publicus*, the Spirit of the State, suddenly appeared before him in a mournful attitude, its head veiled. Without a gesture, without a word, it crossed the pavilion and vanished. Julian confided this vision to his intimates, and Ammianus Marcellinus, who received it from them, has recounted it (25.2). Shortly afterward the emperor was killed.

20. Hubaux, p. 44.

10

THRUSTS AND RESISTANCES

At the same time that Roman religion, stabilized on its traditional foundations by the pontiffs and sensitized to opportunities abroad by the decemvirs, presented the picture of harmonious activity which we have just observed, the causes of immediate and serious changes were already gathering.

Losses in human life during the war were enormous: fifteen thousand at Trasimene, seventy thousand at Cannae, including the consul Aemilius Paullus, two quaestors, eighty senators, twenty-one tribunes, and a host of knights. No family was untouched, and the first measure taken by Fabius was to regulate and limit the period of mourning. To replace so many citizens and allies, Rome initiated a practice fraught with both promise and peril. M. Junius Pera, created dictator by the Senate, raised four legions: they included eight thousand slaves, bought from individuals. The allies were laid under increasingly heavy contribution, making the armies a mixed bag of conscripts commanded by Roman consuls but among whom men of true Roman stock were a minority.

Hannibal's repeated ravages in Italy resulted in the overpopulation of Rome: as at Athens during the Peloponnesian War, but on a far greater scale, entire populations flooded inside the city walls, and to these were added loyal fugitives from the cities in the south which had gone over to the enemy. These upheavals, the devastation of the countryside, and the uncertainty of the future ruined private economy and increased from year to year the number of what came to be called, during the next centuries, the poor class. Even before it became a political force, a maneuverable mass, this class was a source of public unrest and a breeding ground for psychoses.

It was in fact a true psychosis, with outbursts of terror and paroxysms of panic, which possessed the Roman mob during these terrible years. While magistrates and priests calmly administered sacred affairs, this psychosis was generating secret mysteries in a kind of anarchy: the proliferation of prodigies announced in good faith was an almost yearly symptom of this disease, which Livy recognized as such. Another was the multiplication of givers and sellers of oracles or magical formulas, caricatures of cults, and improvised devotions, half-superstitious half-philosophical creeds which could not be controlled by the pontiffs or even, in their manifestations, by the aediles.

The men responsible for Rome, it must be repeated, were never hostile to the official introduction of foreign cults. They themselves took bold steps in this direction, *Hannibale praesente*, and resorted to the *graecus ritus* extensively. Even as "relatives," even when they were received inside the *pomerium*, goddesses like Venus Erycina and the Great Mother are "new" goddesses. Nor were the officials traditionally hostile to the importation of cults by individuals, provided these cults remained private, confined to the family house or to local premises, and did not disturb the course of the Roman ceremonies. But, in the period of Trebia, Trasimene, and Cannae, these limitations were quickly exceeded, and the state, that is, the ruling aristocracy, reacted strongly.

It is no exaggeration to say that the year 213 opens a new era. Caught between its customary policy of welcoming all useful forms of religion and its wish to remain the master and supreme arbiter of divine matters, the senatorial state oscillates between long periods of tolerance and brutal interventions in which we can see a foreshadowing of the struggles between the imperial state and Christianity for mastery of the world, which lasted from the Julian dynasty until the reign of Constantine.

Livy describes this first contest in an eloquent chapter (25.1.6-12). Marcellus, with strong forces, is besieging the troublesome Archimedes in Syracuse. In Spain and, through the Numidian prince Syphax, in Africa, Rome is developing her strength and her network of alliances. But Hannibal is still a threat in the south of Italy, and the young nobles of Tarentum are making ready to betray their city to him.

The longer the war dragged on and success and failure altered the situation, and quite as much so the attitude of men, superstitious fears, in large part foreign at that, invaded the state to such a degree that either men or else gods suddenly seemed changed. And now not only in secret and within the walls of houses were Roman rites abandoned, but in public places also and in the Forum and on the Capitol there was a crowd of women who were following the custom of the fathers neither in their sacrifices nor in prayers to the gods. Petty priests and also prophets had taken hold on men's minds. And the number of these was increased by the mass of rustics forced by want and fear into the city from their farms neglected and endangered because of the long war, and by easy profit from the delusion of others—a trade which they plied as though it were sanctioned. At first good men's indignation was voiced in private; then the matter reached the senate and now even official complaints. The aediles and the three police magistrates [*triumviri capitales*] were roundly censured by the senate because they did not stop it; and after they had attempted to drive that crowd out of the Forum and to scatter the properties required for the rites, they narrowly escaped violence. Now that the disorder appeared to be too strong to be quelled by the lower magistrates, the senate assigned to Marcus Aemilius, the city praetor, the task of freeing the people from such superstitions. He read the decree of the senate in an assembly, and also issued an edict that whoever had books of prophecies or prayers or a ritual of sacrifice set down in writing should bring all such books and writings to him before the first of April, and that no one should sacrifice in a public or consecrated place according to a strange or foreign rite.

The order was carried out strictly and without violence. Once born, however, the tares of religion are not easily destroyed. They became even harder to destroy when the praetor himself, under instructions to annihilate them, opened one of the books which were turned in to him and read in it two oracles. One relating to a recent past, foretold the disaster of Cannae in plain words and with the name of the place; the other promised Rome the final victory if she would vow games to Apollo.¹ The magistrate informed the Senate, which thereupon did the very thing which it had forbidden to individuals: in the next year, 212, the *Ludi Apollinares* were created. "The people took part in them, wearing wreaths of flowers. The married women offered prayers. The doors of the houses were opened, meals were eaten in the open, and the day was marked with every sort of observance" (Liv. 25.11-12). The forgery is obvious. In the initial letters of the

1. Above, pp. 442-43, and below, p. 574.

Saturnian verses which can be inferred from the lightly corrected text of the first of the *carmina Marciana*, Leon Herrmann has recently discovered the acrostic "Anci Marci" and has conjectured that a well-meaning forger (he is thinking of the poet Livius Andronicus), possibly inspired by one of the decemvirs, tried to raise the morale of the nation by means of prophecies originating with the fourth king of Rome and consequently older and more Roman than the Sibylline Books themselves.² This might explain why the Senate was so ready to authenticate these writings at the very time that it was destroying all the others.

So begins the history of an intermittent and unequal struggle, monotonous in its principle, but varied in the occasions which brought it about. It will be enough to describe its first episodes: the banning of the Bacchanalia in 186, and the destruction of the Books of Numa in 181.

The event of 186 is well known from Livy's lively and detailed account of it (39.8-18), and also from an epigraphic document so explicit that we should like to have many more like it: the very text of the senatorial decree which closed the matter, along with the covering letter from the consuls to the addressees, the *foederatei*. Engraved on a bronze plaque which was discovered in 1640 in Bruttium, these venerable texts now rest in the museum at Vienna.

It is not possible to ascertain when the mysteries of Bacchus reached Rome. At the time of the scandal, they suddenly appear spread over an immense area. Adrien Bruhl has indicated as far as possible, in the cities of Magna Graecia, the traces of the powerful Dionysiac movement which was observed throughout the Greek or Hellenized world at the end of the fourth century and during the whole of the third.³ At Tarentum, this movement was only a revival: in the sixth century the god had been associated with the chthonian goddesses. Plato (*Leg.* 1.637b) says, "I have seen the whole city in a state of drunkenness on the occasion of the Dionysia." Many third-century terra-cotta statues which can be seen in the town museum portray Bacchus in his two aspects: the older, which shows a mature man with

2. "Carmina Marciana," *Coll. Lat.* 45 (*Hommages à G. Dumézil*) (1960): 117-23, with the bibliography.

3. *Liber Pater* (1953), pp. 49-69.

a long beard; and the more recent, showing a voluptuous and sometimes effeminate young god. Tarentum surely played a large role in the expansion of the mysteries through Italy: after the affair of the Bacchanalia, according to Livy, the praetor L. Postumius had to suppress there the *coniurationes* of *pastores*, who were very probably groups of Dionysiac *bucoli*. In the same period Metapontum, Heraclea on the Siris, and Locri, and in the wine country of Sicily, the towns of Syracuse and Selinus went through a flowering of the Dionysiac cult to which their coins bear witness. The Greeks in Campania, another land of vineyards, were also active in this cult: an inscription at Cumae dating from the first half of the fifth century proves that there was a place in the cemetery reserved for the burial of the bacchants, *βεβακχευμένοι*: purified by their initiation, they intended to benefit from this privilege in the hereafter. From Tarentum and Campania the Dionysiac religion spread to the Oscans and to Apulia, where an important ceramic workshop, at Gnathia, turned out many vases depicting Bacchic subjects, and where for several years Rome's "anti-Bacchanalian" policies encountered stubborn resistance. The cult also reached Etruria, which maintained regular commercial and cultural contacts with Magna Graecia, and which was already acquainted with the god through the mythology of the potters. The Etruscans had interpreted him as *Fufluns*, a god who was himself probably borrowed from some Italic peoples (from **Populon(i)o-*?); and, as we have seen,⁴ from ancient times the *Loufir*, *Liber* of the Latin cities had also given Dionysus his name or had taken over his special function, the patronage of wine. In the comedies of Plautus, at the end of the third century, the assimilation is so complete that *Liber* must often be understood as *uinum*. But this ancient Liber Pater had never been involved in anything which might have upset the Senate, and in 186 he was not regarded as having any connection with the condemned orgies.

It is also difficult to ascertain the doctrinal and ideological content of the Dionysiac cult in Italy and Rome, beyond the practices which Livy denounces so severely.⁵ What is sure is that it answered the

4. Above, p. 378; Bruhl, pp. 70-81 ("Le Dionysos étrusque").

5. J. Festugière, "Ce que Tite-Live nous apprend des mystères de Dionysos," *MEFR* 66 (1954): 79-99. Bibliography (notably G. Méautis and Y. Béquignon) on the Bacchanalia affair in Latte, p. 270, n. 5; add to this C. Cichorius, "Hellenistisches zum Senatusconsultum de Bacchanalibus," *Römische Studien* (1922), pp. 21-24, and of course the fine statement by

same needs and the same distresses that had brought emotional crowds of common people as well as a number of superior minds to these mysteries two centuries earlier in Greece itself, with the risks and the enticements to which the *Bacchae* of Euripides (405) still bears witness. The official cults of the city were no longer enough; a hunger for mystical experiences, for brotherhood and love transcending human regulations; the bold acceptance of supranormal ways of knowing, the simplest of which is in the intoxication of wine, with more intellectual borrowings from Orphism proper; and the wish for firm guarantees of a hereafter glimpsed briefly during the initiation ceremonies—all these factors united growing groups of dissatisfied people in secret communities, without regard for political or social barriers. It cannot be stated that slaves were admitted to these communities, but it is worth noting that the wife of Spartacus, the Thracian leader of the servile uprising in 73, was a prophetess, a kind of medium in the Dionysiac orgies. Of the same nationality as he, she had interpreted a prodigy in Rome when they were put up for sale in the slave market: while Spartacus lay sleeping, a snake coiled itself around his head, and his wife declared that this was a sign portending great and formidable power to him, but with no happy outcome.⁶ Plutarch says that she fled to the back country with him and accompanied him in his desperate undertaking (*Crass.* 8.3). During the time she was at Rome, a slave like him, it is not likely that this bacchant was idle. But we can form no conclusion from this story as to the cult of Dionysus at the beginning of the preceding century.

Did the secret sessions degenerate into debauchery? It is possible. But, with the senatorial decree and Livy's orthodox commentary on it, we know only the views of the accusers. It is well known how in religious controversies the most heinous sins are attributed readily and in complete good faith to the adversary: witches' sabbaths and black masses are common accusations in every age. In his attack on the Pythagorean Vatinius (*Vat.* 14), Cicero does not hesitate to accuse

Bruhl, pp. 82-116. F. Matz, *ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΑΚΗ ΤΕΛΕΤΗ*, *Archäologische Untersuchungen zum Dionysoskult in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit* (1964) (with a new study of the Dionysiac scenes in the Villa of the Mysteries); R. Turcan, *Les sarcophages romains à représentations dionysiaques, essai de chronologie et d'histoire religieuse*, 1966.

6. *ἀρρυξές* is a very probable emendation by Reiske for the *εὐρυξές* in the manuscripts.

him of calling up the dead and appeasing them with the sacrifice of young boys, *puerorum extis*—whereas it is probable that all the Pythagoreans did was to “enchant,” or as we should say, to hypnotize the boys and make use of their visions (Apul. *Mag.* 42).⁷

From the very beginning the affair seemed so serious that the two consuls charged by the Senate with conducting the investigation thought they would have to neglect the armies and the preparation for war. And yet, if we are to believe the dossier which was available to Livy, the start of this *labes*, this epidemic, had been both recent and insignificant. A base-born, uncultured Greek is said to have crossed over to Etruria: a mere priestling and soothsayer of a confidential religion. There at first he initiated only a few persons, later admitting to the mysteries men and women indiscriminately, and “to win the greatest number of initiates possible, he combined the pleasures of wine and banquets with his religion.” Darkness and the indiscriminate mingling of sexes and ages completed the job. “Each person found the kind of pleasure which corresponded most closely to his inclinations.” This attempt at demoralization, we are told, did not stop with orgies: false evidence, false signatures, false wills, slanderous denunciations, and, of course, murders and secret poisonings were also common. “Wild howlings and the noise of drums and cymbals drowned out the violence, and kept one from hearing the groans of the victims amid the debaucheries and murders.” It is hard to give any credence to those reports, so similar to those which every police force in the world is able, without much trouble, to gather in the vicinity of noisy spots. Be that as it may, the contagion reached Rome: the great cities offer ready shelter to what creates scandal elsewhere. Probably nothing would have happened without what we should nowadays call a nasty little gigolo, whose mother and stepfather were intending him for initiation. Supported by a famous courtesan, the youthful P. Ebutius, perhaps desirous of some freedom, one day laughingly announced to his protectress that he would be sleeping away from her bed for a few nights, in order to discharge a vow made for his recovery from illness: he had to receive initiation into the mysteries of Bacchus. The girl raised a storm; there were curses and tears: then she told him that before her manumission

7. J. Carcopino, *La basilique pythagoricienne de la Porte Majeure* (1926), pp. 202 (and n. 2), 204; cf. pp. 156–57, on the Dionysiac scenes in the basilica.

she had been taken to this sanctuary by her master and that frightfully improper things happened there. Like every initiate, she had sworn never to reveal anything she had seen, but with her lover in danger, what did this oath matter to her? Returning home, the young man told his mother and stepfather that the initiation was all off. Chased out of the paternal home, where his ways and his friends were only too well known, he took refuge with the sister of his deceased father, an elderly and respectable lady, who apparently had no love for her remarried sister-in-law. This lady persuaded her nephew to go and tell everything to one of the consuls. The consul got in touch with this pious woman and, through her, with the virtuous courtesan, whom he then handled with the usual methods, threats and blackmail; she did not hold out for long. At first, she said, the sanctuary had been open only to women, each of whom in turn acted as priestess, and at that time there were only three days in the year set aside for initiation, with no night-time observances. But a certain Paculla Annia, a woman from Campania, had changed all this at the alleged command of the gods. The rites were given to men and were celebrated at night and five times a month. And so the horrors began—and the repentant courtesan gave a long and colorful description of them, starting with sexual intercourse between men and ending with instruments of torture worthy of the Divine Marquis's *120 Days of Sodom*. The sect, she added, was already so numerous that it almost formed a separate congregation, with men and women of noble families belonging to it; two years ago it had been decided not to initiate anyone older than twenty, since young people yielded more easily to sin and debauchery. . . . After putting the informers in a safe place, the consul notified the Senate, which gave him a vote of thanks and began its work of suppression. It was terrible. The senators called for denunciations, whole sections of the town were ransacked, and the consul, after calling the people together, delivered a speech in which he let them know what his first measures would be. He urged the people to join his effort at purification without fear of offending the gods. There was a panic. Guards placed at the exits from the city made mass arrests of those who tried to leave. Many men and women committed suicide. It was said that there were more than seven thousand "conspirators." Their leaders—a Faliscan, a Campanian, and two plebeians—were quickly denounced and were

executed on the spot. However, the repressive measures became so widespread that it was necessary to limit them: only those were beheaded (but they were the majority) who had actually practiced the abominations to which their oath as initiates had bound them, while those who had only taken this oath were imprisoned. Following ancient usage, the condemned women were remanded to their families or their guardians to be executed.

The panic was not confined to Rome. As the news spread, all Italy had occasion to tremble. Presently the consuls dispatched to every community copies of the senatorial decree which regulated the future practice of this religion, with orders to engrave it on bronze and post it publicly; one copy of this decree, that of the "*ager Teuranus*," has survived to our times. The exact correspondence of this archaic text with Livy's summation of it guarantees the historian's reliability if not the good faith or intelligence of the persecutors. The regulations they prescribed were as follows. No more *Bacanal*. If someone claimed that he absolutely had to have such a sanctuary, he had to apply to the urban praetor. The latter, after hearing his case, would submit the matter to the Senate, which could consider it only if there were at least one hundred senators in session. The same procedure was necessary for a citizen, a Latin, or an ally who wished to become a *Bacas*. No more male priests. No more organization or common property. No more of those ties which are specified in the piled-up verbs: *inter sed conieura*[*se-neu*]*e comuouise neue conspondise neue compromesise neue fidem inter sed dedise* . . . No more secret cult, or even public or private ceremonies, save in the presence of the city praetor, himself expressly authorized by a decree of the Senate made by at least one hundred senators. Finally, no more gatherings for the ceremonies of more than five persons, two men and three women, except by permission of the praetor and the Senate. The courtesan and her lover were not only protected but well rewarded: she was legally declared an honest woman, fit to marry a free man without her husband's honor or position being compromised by this marriage; and the young man received a veteran's pension, with the exemption for serving either in the cavalry or as an infantryman. As for the other informers, it was left to the discretion of the consuls whether they should merely go unpunished or receive extra rewards.

From this text it becomes clear that the only crime of the unfortu-

nate bacchants was that they had formed *alterum iam prope populum*, to use the phrase which Livy attributes to the courtesan, and, as we read in Postumius's speech, that they had organized secret gatherings, whereas only three types of assembly were allowed in Rome: the *comitia* proclaimed by the banner on the Capitol, the *plebis consilium* determined by the tribunes, and the *contio*, a gathering called by one of the magistrates. And it is remarkable that the Senate, at the close of this outbreak of cruel severity, was unwilling to destroy the impeached cult, even in its new and foreign form, even with the mingling of the sexes, but wished only to limit it and to subject it in every case to the authorization and control of the officials, and above all, to prevent *con-iuratio*, the forming of any reciprocal or collective obligations. With this stipulation it was quite possible for anyone to come and say *sibi necessu esse Bacanal*, or for a citizen to seek to be a *Bacas*. But he had to ask for permission.

After the bloody violence which has left an indelible stain on the consulate of Q. Marcius L.f. and S. Postumius L.f., the history of the Books of Numa, in 181, is like a restful comedy. It is nonetheless still an episode in the same struggle between tradition and innovation. In that year, says Livy (40.29.3-14), some farmers digging at the foot of the Janiculum, in a field belonging to the scribe L. Petilius,⁸ uncovered two stone chests measuring eight feet long by four feet wide, the lids of which were sealed with lead. Inscriptions in Greek and Latin said that Numa Pompilius, the son of Pompo, king of the Romans, was buried in one of these chests, and that the other contained the books of this Numa Pompilius. The owner of the field consulted his friends and opened the two chests. The first was completely empty, with no trace of a human body. The second held two

8. Latte, p. 269, n. 2, thinks that the name of the scribe, in Livy, is a copyist's error. On this affair, See A. Delatte, "Les doctrines pythagoriciennes des livres de Numa," *BAB* 22 (1936): 19-40, and Carcopino, p. 185, both of whom think that an actual undertaking by the Pythagoreans in Rome is involved here. The unease of the Roman authorities could be explained as follows: the Books of Numa contained a variety of *φυσικὸς λόγος*, "semi-cosmological, semi-moral interpretation of religious beliefs," the antiquity of which in Pythagoreanism has been pointed out by A. Delatte; and certain parts of this *φ.λ.* "must have contradicted the beliefs relating to the fulgural and augural art and the *procuratio* of prodigies" (Delatte, p. 33). Although the greater number of the ancient authors (known to us chiefly through Pliny and Saint Augustine) speak of authentic treatises on Pythagorean philosophy, some of them, such as Sempronius Tuditanus (Plin. 13.87), mention only the religious decrees of Numa found in the second sarcophagus.

packages tied up with string and coated with pitch, each containing seven books which were not only intact but seemed entirely new. Half of them, composed in Latin, dealt with pontifical law, and the other half, in Greek, were about philosophy as it existed in those far-off times. The scribe and his friends read these venerable tracts with surprising ease; they showed them to others, and as the word spread, the city praetor Q. Petilius expressed a desire to read them too and borrowed them from their owner. The two men were connected: when Quintus was quaestor he had obtained for Lucius his position as scribe. Now, however, when he had read all the books, he was convinced that there was something in them which might destroy the official religion, and he notified his protégé that he was determined to throw them into the fire; but that before carrying out this intention, he would allow Lucius to reclaim them through legal channels or by any other means; and finally that he would not withdraw his favor for this reason. The scribe applied to the tribunes of the people, who passed the matter on to the Senate. The praetor declared that he was ready to swear that it was not expedient to read or to preserve these books, and the Senate decided that this offer of an oath was enough, that the books would be burned as soon as possible on the *comitium*, and that the owner would be paid an indemnity to be set by the praetor and the majority of the tribunes. The scribe refused the money. The books were publicly burned on the *comitium* in a fire kindled by *victimarii*.

We glimpse here a rather sordid little news item: profiting by his protector's advancement to the praetorship, Lucius thought he might make some money from his forgery. As for Quintus, he was at once a good fellow and a conscientious man. Whether the "books of Numa" actually did seem to him to constitute a danger to religion, or whether he merely thought the forgeries were too clumsy to stand close examination, he had them destroyed, thus saving his imprudent protégé from a fatal appraisal, and even assuring him of a profit, which Lucius had the good grace to turn down. The incident would be without importance, were it not accompanied by two circumstances. First the reason given for the *auto-da-fé* and the immediate, decisive effect which it produced on the Senate: even though the writings were guaranteed by the great name of Numa—the history of the beginnings of Rome had received its canonical form at least a

century before—since they contained innovations, or contravened tradition, *pleraque dissoluendarum religionum esse*, nobody was minded to defend them, and the tribunes took their stand beforehand with the foreseeable decision of the Senate.

It is no less interesting to see this forgery produced under the name of a Numa who was not only a pontiff but a philosopher: seven of the books dealt, in Greek, *de disciplina sapientiae*. Livy uses the great word, and immediately disputes it vigorously. Valerius Antias, the predecessor whom he delights in attacking, had said that the books found in the second chest were Pythagorean, thereby conforming to the widely prevalent opinion that Numa had been an *auditor*, or disciple, of Pythagoras. Cicero also will protest, or make Scipio protest, this statement and show the discrepancy of dates (*Rep.* 2.28: *falsum est id totum, neque solum fictum, sed etiam imperite absurdeque fictum*). No arguments availed. For many Romans Numa was still the Pythagorean king, a valuable and ancient link between Greece and Rome between wisdom and politics. But the *inueteratus error* is certainly much older than the forgery by L. Petilius, or rather, with all due respect to the shades of Cicero and Livy, there is no mistake: Pythagoreanism was undoubtedly one of the components of Numa's character when it was created, in the time when clever scholars formed the vulgate version of the history of the kings. These elements are inseparable from the image of the king: to portray the two equally necessary aspects of power in tandem, the first annalists embodied the characteristics of Greek tyranny in Romulus, who represented the puissant, creative, but terrible side of kingship, and made a philosopher of Numa, who stood for the god-fearing, law-giving, wise, and intellectual side. For these annalists, the philosophy of the kingly period could only be that of Pythagoras, a son of Magna Graecia to be sure, but consequently also of Italy, and a man for whom at a very early date those Romans who had a little learning cherished feelings of cousinhood. "When the consciousness of an Italic nationality came into being," says Jérôme Carcopino (pp. 161–62), "it turned to Pythagoreanism. Likewise, when Pythagoreanism was formed, it was Italian. As heirs of this interrelated tradition, the Romans of the classical era gloried in it, and Cicero proudly lays claim to it for the honor of his compatriots (*Amic.* 13; *Sen.* 78: *Pythagoram Pythagoreosque incolas paene nostros*)." Thus Cato the Censor, a

Roman of the Romans, a contemporary of the Bacchanalia affair and the L. Petilius fraud, feels no scruples about converting to this philosophy toward the end of his life. "It is not surprising," says Carcopino (p. 186), "that Cato himself should have yielded to the contagion: there is an undeniable affinity between the harsh discipline on which his generation prided itself and the asceticism of the Pythagoreans. . . . Thanks to this affinity, they were welcomed to the vigorous and healthy city whose harmony and energy had just preserved the independence of Italy and were making ready to give it the world." This verdict is penetrating and just, but the intellectual movement must surely be placed at an earlier date. As Carcopino himself remarks (pp. 183-84), Cicero did not invent it, any more than Appius Claudius Caecus, the famous censor of 312, another embodiment of the ideal of the Roman patriciate, who composed a poem inspired by Pythagoreanism. Around the same time, the Aemilii (Mamercini, later Mamerci) proudly claim as an ancestor "Mamercos," who is identified to suit the needs of the case with Marmakos, the son of Pythagoras. Later, at the beginning of the third century, the statue of the philosopher was erected in the Forum as the *sapientissimus* of the Greek nation (next to that of Alcibiades, who was described as the *fortissimus*). Finally the *Annales* of Ennius started with the account of a dream in which metempsychosis was triumphant. Therefore, we must not include this "naturalization" of Pythagoreanism, this natural sympathy of the Roman intellectuals for the philosophy which boasted the name of Pythagoras among the innovations of the closing third century.

It is quite necessary to specify: intellectuals, philosophy. In fact, it was only by being restricted to this social group and this lofty sphere that the match had been possible, and the event of 181 is good proof of this fact. As long as Pythagoreanism suggests a way of life, recommends such harmless practices as vegetarianism, or offers the consolations of another world which Rome, left to her own devices, cannot populate or give life to, it is welcome, and it is a matter of general satisfaction that Numa is a Pythagorean, or even that some bolder spirits make Pythagoras a Roman citizen (Plut. *Num.* 8.11). But when it begins to produce writings like those of which the purge of 213 rid the city; when, only a few years after the business of the Bacchanalia, it risks stirring up the religious emotions of the masses

by means of a sensational discovery, then Numa must be put back in his proper place, in the *Annales*. The perspectives of the incident in 181 are limited to this. The burning of the second king's forged books does not seem to be "a symptom of the underground propaganda which Pythagorean thought was developing in the city and of the fears which its spread aroused in the established authorities." The enterprise of the overingenious scribe was strictly personal. A century or a century and a half later, the Pythagoreans will perhaps form their own chapels. Those of this earlier era did not mix the genres of religion and philosophy, and their religious practice was not contaminated by their dreams of wisdom.

More serious interferences occurred in the course of this century. After Carneades, the philosophers,⁹ the "Chaldeans," astrologers and fortune-tellers, were forcibly expelled. Cato (*Agr.* 5) had already called them dangerous. Among the duties which he prescribes for the rural overseer, two concern religion and both of these limit the activity of this person, one in the Roman rites (*rem diuinam nisi Compitalibus in compito aut in foco ne faciat*), the other with regard to strange foreign rites (*haruspitem augurem hariolum chaldaicum ne quem consuluisse uelit*). The strict and miserly Cato seems to have regarded these temptations only as the occasion for useless expenditures. We have to believe that in the year 139, despite the Catos, the *Chaldaei* were highly successful throughout Italy, for in that year the *praetor peregrinus* ordered them to leave Rome and Italy within six days. According to Valerius Maximus (1.3.3), they involved weak and ignorant minds in darkness and made themselves a great deal of money. The same praetor expelled other foreigners who, under color of honoring Jupiter Sabazios, were striving to corrupt the Romans.

9. From a special but very important point of view, W. Capelle, "Griechische Ethik und römischer Imperialismus," *Klio* 25 (1932): 86-113.

II

THE CIVIL WARS AND RELIGION

During the century which followed the Second Punic War Rome acquired vast territories. But the Republic and the Roman tradition were thereby profoundly and continually altered. Indeed we must use the word decomposition here. A fruitful decomposition, since it ends with the springtime of Augustus and the rebuilding by the emperors, but also a terrible decomposition, since it ushers in the darkest period of Rome's life, the era of the civil wars.

The causes and modalities of this "decadence" are well known. The commanders and soldiers of the legions are corrupted by contact with the East. The wealth which floods into Rome in the form of spoils or presents, the golden rain abruptly poured onto a society without industry or commerce, corrupts the economy, morals, and social relationships. A few censors, primarily Cato, struggle obstinately against the evil, revising the list of the Senate and imposing sumptuary laws. But by now the evil is everywhere, and especially in the nobility. The censor Lepidus, grand pontiff and prince of the Senate, wants to build a dam at Terracina to protect his lands from flooding: he uses public funds for this purpose. In Illyria, a Senate commissioner takes a bribe from a king and closes his inquiry with a report in favor of him. In Spain, Metellus promises himself a glorious and profitable war, but is recalled; he thereupon destroys the provisions, kills the elephants, and disorganizes the army. The Numidian king Jugurtha, summoned to Rome to account for his conduct, is not afraid to come: having already corrupted ambassadors, he knows that he will be able to buy a tribune who will conveniently forbid him to speak; and when he departs he will be credited with the famous remark, "City for sale! All you lack is a buyer!"

The internal crisis which began during Hannibal's years in Italy matured rapidly, and more than matured. Rome, as Catiline will say, is a body without a head, and a head without a body: on the one hand, a huge mass of the poor and needy; on the other, a small number of families, plebeians as well as patricians, glutted with the riches of the world. The middle class, the principal source of manpower for the earlier legions, no longer exists. The conflict is not between plebeians and patricians, but between rich and poor, between the propertied class and the proletarians. Proletarian is the proper word here, in the Roman meaning: this name is applied to those whose only contribution to the life of the *ciuitas* is their children, *prolis progenie*, and it was the Roman rule to exclude them from the army, since they had no property of their own to defend, and would not be good defenders of other men's property (Gell. 16.10; Paul. p. 333 L²). Consequently, Rome needed soldiers, and it was not long before Marius (107) was enlisting the proletarians and even the *capite censi* regularly, as well as the Italians.

The Italians, the loyal as well as the repentant, engulf the city, permeating every corner and sharing in the general misery. It was their lands which had made up the vast *latifundia* now held by some thousands of men. Rome's distant conquests have not profited them, but these conquests are not finished yet. The Italians constantly aspire to the title of citizen, which is still denied them as it was in earlier times: they covet it not just for the honor but in the hope, the illusion, of sharing in far-off spoils.

In Roman society as it conceives itself, the slaves count for nothing. However, in a material sense, they now form a terrifying quantity. So many victorious wars have saturated Rome with them. The great landowners no longer use free workers: all the work can be done for nothing by the slaves. They are everywhere, and even when peaceful, they represent a power everywhere. The leaders who are quarreling over the control of Rome seek their support: in the struggle in which C. Gracchus is killed, his adversary, the consul Opimius, orders slaves to fight side by side with the senators and the knights; with them he seizes the Capitol, while Caius and the former consul Fulvius, falling back on the temple of Diana on the Aventine, appeal to the slaves along the way in the name of liberty.

From the slave class emerge the freedmen, whose number will

increase and who will shortly form an important part of the Roman people. How can they be expected to have a good acquaintance with the traditions or a true attachment to the ancient customs?

In this political and social ferment, the public religion is unruffled. The routine of the old cults goes on, and a few new cults are created in accordance with traditional procedures. But this is the tranquillity of an aging organism:¹ when Hannibal was threatening Rome, religion was an active and reassuring force. Furthermore, the East and Greece are about to become or have already become Roman lands; hordes of citizens, military men, government officials, and businessmen, journey thither, and in the remaining old Romans and in the new ones, the transfusion of beliefs, practices, and doubts is accelerated. The satirist Lucilius, a rich knight, friend of Scipio Aemilianus, and Pompey's uncle, scourges the vices, greed, and carelessness of the newly rich, but he treats the gods with surprising familiarity and portrays the Great Twelve sitting in council and making fun of those who call them *pater*. He shows Neptune hopelessly enmeshed in an argument, and has him say that Carneades could not possibly extricate himself from it, even if Orcus gave him his freedom. Elsewhere he cites whole lines of the purest Greek mythology, associates Tisiphone with the *Eumenidum sanctissima Erinys*, and shows Sisyphus sweating under his rock, all the while seasoning his Latin with Greek nouns, verbs, and phrases. And yet he is a traditionalist, with aristocratic connections. Imagine the liberties, the licenses taken by the new men, the men who were on the way up!

It would be useless to attempt a systematic analysis of the religious life of this period, to try to discover a regular evolution or long-range intentions. Apart from the routine of the old cults, the religious history of Rome at this time is confused with her political history or with the biographies of a few outstanding individuals. Reforms or innovations, the rise of one cult and the decline of another, occur hap-

1. The invasion, degradation, and repression of the religious by the political factor must also be taken into account. There are two good examples in J. Bleicken, "Kollisionen zwischen *Sacrum* und *Publicum*, eine Studie zum Verfall der altrömischen Religion," *Hermes* 85 (1957): 446-80 (1. "Die Provokationsprozesse gegen den Oberpontifex"; 2. "Die Obnuntiation"). See also R. Guenther, "Der politisch-ideologische Kampf in der römischen Religion in den letzten zwei Jahrhunderten v.u.Z.," *Klio* 42 (1964): 209-97 (political utilization of the prodigies in the class struggles; of Venus by Sulla, of Dionysos by Antony, and of Apollo by Octavius—the last-named finding literary expression in Virgil's Fourth Eclogue and in Horace's *carmen saeculare*).

hazardly as the sides shift, or depend on the inspirations or needs of ambitious men. Until the great reorganization and reanimation achieved by Augustus, "Roman religion" is less than ever a subject for independent study. We shall confine ourselves here to a few brief remarks about what it was during the last century of the Republic, and first to some statements about what it lacked.

The movements which for more than a hundred years brought on the internal contradictions of Rome and of the Empire were as a whole sterile from the religious point of view. The slave revolts, which several times took on the aspect of major wars, had no foundation of faith or philosophy. How could it have been otherwise? From Gaul to Persia, from the land of the Moors to the boundaries of Thrace, the hordes of slaves owned by the great landholders came from everywhere. What divinity, what hope, could they have agreed on?² The prestige of the men who commanded them was often enhanced by magical artifices or by rumors of divine protection which might perhaps have produced some cult if the undertaking had been successful, but which did not survive them. The first of these, the Syrian Eunus, a slave in Sicily, raised a good-sized army within a short time and held several legions in check (133); the report of his successes sent a thrill through slave bands throughout the Empire, and there were uprisings at Delos, in Attica, in Campania, even in Latium. And yet his religious contribution amounts only to this: communicating with the gods in his dreams, he had forecast that he would be king—in fact, he called himself King Antiochus—and had confirmed his prophecy by a cheap hoax; hiding a nut filled with burning sulphur in his mouth, he breathed forth flames (Diod. Sic. 34.2.5-7). A third of a century later, another revolt of Sicilian slaves which lasted three years had among its leaders a Cilician named Athenion; he was renowned for his accomplishments in astromancy (ibid. 36.5.1).³

2. F. Bömer, *Untersuchungen über die Religion der Sklaven in Griechenland und Rom* (1957), Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaft und Literatur, Mainz, vol. 7, 1:182 (1956): "Der Spartacus-Aufstand hatte keine philosophischen oder religiösen Voraussetzungen, ebenso wenig wie der des Eunus aus Henna." The author indicates the contrary opinion of J. Vogt, *Struktur der antiken Sklavenkriege* (1957), ibid., 1: 27-39.

3. Athenion's superior, Salvius, who succeeded in organizing a true kingdom, seems to have wished to arouse the particularist religious feeling of the Sicilians, his "subjects," by offering spectacular tributes to the "heroes Palici." Diod. Sic. 37.7.1. On the religions of the island, see E. Manni, *Sicilia pagana* (1963), but E. Ciaceri, *Culti e miti nella storia dell'antica Sicilia* (1911), is still valuable.

Thirty years later still, the greatest of these "damnés de la Terre," the Thracian Spartacus (73-71), owed his power to his own talents, to be sure, but the Bacchic gifts of his wife did him no harm. It is useless to wonder what would have become of the thought of the ancient world if these outbreaks of violence had succeeded: they could not succeed. With good reason Spartacus, if not his predecessors, is honored as an illustrious ancestor by the modern theorists of the class war. But the time was not yet ripe, and it was not through revolt that this archaic form of exploitation of man by his fellow man was to disappear.

The Social War (90-88), that is, the war which eight peoples of southern Italy leagued around the Marsians conducted in order to obtain the title of Roman citizens, did not contain the germs of a religious change any more than did the slave revolts. There is not even any mention of the famous military cults of the era of the Caudine Forks, although the Samnites had been involved in that episode, or of the *legio linteata* and the terrible initiation ceremonies which gave it its prestige. Against the Romans the insurgents used an army and tactics which were entirely Roman. This was no more than a fratricidal struggle. In the heat of battle they had large pretensions of destroying Rome and of taking her place by imitating her, and on one of their coins the Sabellian bull is shown crushing the she-wolf. But in the very beginning, before the first bloodshed, the two "Italian" consuls had made a last vain diplomatic representation to the Roman Senate and at the end, when, by enacting the *lex Julia* and the *lex Plautia Papiria*, a barely victorious Rome had the good sense to give in without losing face, the bad memories were quickly forgotten. With citizenship, the Italians were ready to take part in what was to be Rome's fate, the civil war.

The era of these great troubles begins after the Gracchi, with Marius. Forceful personalities assert themselves, for the most part from their youth; they rule for a while and then sooner or later perish at the hands of a rival. These brawls, in which Italy and sometimes the whole world are involved willy-nilly, foreshadow the worst moments of the Empire. Their cost to the substance of Rome, Italy, and the provinces is enormous.⁴ Florus remarks (2.9.22) that the partisans of

4. P. Jal, "Remarques sur la cruauté à Rome pendant les guerres civiles," *LH* 20 (1961): 475-501; "La guerre civile à Rome (de Sylla à Vespasien), facteur de vie morale?" *ibid.*

Marius devastated Campania and Etruria much more frightfully than Hannibal and Pyrrhus. According to Dio Cassius (fragment 105.8), the slaughter ordered by Sulla in 82 was more murderous and cruel than the massacre of the Romans by Mithridates in Asia Minor, and even Livy, to judge by the summary of his eighty-eighth book, portrayed Sulla as "filling all of Italy with murders." This harshness peculiar to fratricidal struggles will become a commonplace of the Christian polemicists: *plus paene bella ciuilia quam hostis mucro consumpsit* . . . (Hieronymus, *Epistolae* 60.7). The men in the public eye were naturally the first targets in the proscriptions, and in this way Rome lost many of its most valuable assets. The men, however, with very few exceptions, resigned themselves to the new law in a kind of contagion. "Everything takes place," says J. Bayet, "as if the savagery of the civil wars had set back men's minds, even the most cultured, to almost prehistoric ways of thought: the fatal calling of the warrior, and reciprocal shedding of blood."⁵ An example: After Marius's death (January 86), C. Flavius Fimbria ordered the murder of the grand pontiff, Q. Mucius Scaevola, who had been guilty of moderation. Mucius was struck down, but did not die. Fimbria thereupon announced his intention to summon him for judgment by the people, and when asked what charge he would make against this man, universally honored *pro sanctitate morum*, he replied, "I shall accuse him of not having been stabbed deeply enough!" (Val. Max. 9.11.2).

What echoes, what resonances could such cruel spectacles have stirred up in religious ideology? No doubt in Greece they would have suggested the idea of fatality, or one of those primordial crimes which cast their shadow and impose their expiation on generation after generation, as at Argos or Thebes. The "history" of the origins provided a starting point: was not Rome born from the blood of Remus, slain by his brother or at his brother's command? The poets of the great century will use and explore this broad theme. At the moment when hostilities between the triumvirate and Sextus

11 (1962): 399-434; "Les dieux et les guerres civiles," *REL* 40 (1962): 170-200. These are fragments of a unified work, originally announced under the title "La notion de guerre civile," which appeared in 1963: *La guerre civile à Rome, étude littéraire et morale*. See also A. N. Sherwin-White, "Violence in Roman Politics," *JRS* 46 (1956): 1-9.

5. "Le suicide mutuel dans la mentalité des Romains," *Année sociologique*, 1951, pp. 15-89; the quoted lines are on p. 76.

Pompey were about to resume, Horace, who was still a young man, wrote the poem which became the seventh of the collected *Epodes*. It is worth quoting in full:

Whither, whither are ye rushing to ruin in your wicked frenzy? Or why are your hands grasping the swords that have once been sheathed? Has too little Roman blood been shed on field and flood—not that the Roman might burn the proud towers of jealous Carthage, or that the Briton, as yet unscathed, might descend the Sacred Way in fetters, but that, in fulfilment of the Parthians' prayers, this city might perish by its own right hand? Such habit ne'er belonged to wolves or lions, whose fierceness is turned only against beasts of other kinds. Does some blind frenzy drive us on, or some stronger power, or guilt? Give answer!—They speak not; a ghastly pallor o'erspreads their faces, and dazed are their shattered senses. 'Tis so: a bitter fate pursues the Romans, and the crime of a brother's murder, ever since the blameless Remus' blood was spilt upon the ground, to be a curse upon posterity.

Under Augustus the official propaganda will take up this theme again: the great achievement of the prince is that under him Roman has been reconciled with Roman—*Remo cum fratre Quirinus*.⁶ But this is merely a belletristic device. Religion takes no interest in it, and the idea of a hereditary curse was too foreign to Roman thought to be acclimated at this late date.⁷ Moreover, the fable had been given permanent form a long time ago: whether or not Romulus was responsible for the death of his brother, he had rid himself of contamination through several ceremonies, and, according to some, through the empty chair which he always had placed by his side when he was performing his kingly duties.⁸

Far from producing a religious explanation of events which was compatible with the traditional data and which gave them additional meaning, the protracted civil wars, *bella impia*, were a factor in weakening the strength of the tradition and even of belief in the gods. Altogether, they had the inverse effect of the victories over enemies

6. Above, pp. 258–62.

7. A different opinion in H. Wagenvoort, "The Crime of Fratricide (Hor. *Epod.* 7.18): The Figure of Romulus Quirinus in the Political Struggle of the 1st Century B.C.," *Studies in Roman Literature, Culture, and Religion* (1956), pp. 169–83. R. Schilling stresses the concern shown by Ovid, for example, to acquit Romulus, "Romulus l'élú et Rémus le réprouvé," *REL* 38 (1960): 182–99 (but I doubt that Ov. *F.* 2.361–80, intends to present a sin or sacrilege committed by Remus).

8. In Christian polemic, this will even be an argument against the pagan gods: they did not punish Romulus's fratricide, or his mother's fault (Aug. *Ciu. D.* 3.5 and 6).

from abroad, and especially over Hannibal. If Rome, united and mistress of the world, was the living proof of the existence and solicitude of the gods, Rome torn asunder, a Rome which had become the stake for which inhuman men and unscrupulous partisans gambled, proved either the nonexistence of the gods or their indifference or their hostility. The goddess Mens had survived the fickleness of the plebeian consul and the disaster of Cannae, but how could the scandalous story of the temple of Concordia not have discredited the ancient system of personified abstractions? How could the *felicitas* of Sulla and the favor of the gods which seemed to accompany him almost to the end of his career not have discouraged or disgusted his innumerable victims? In the following century, how does one justify the fact that the most honorable men, the defenders of the Republic, are defeated and driven to suicide? Well before Lucan's famous line (I.128),

uictrix causa deis placuit sed uicta Catoni,

the onlookers at these dismal disputes had to get used to weighing the conduct of the gods against the moral deserts of certain men.⁹ More surely than the criticism of the philosophers, such comparisons destroyed religion. Epicurus, the *Grainus homo*, had faced the divine phantoms with only a verbal courage; the Stoic Cato put on an act, and what an act! It will need no less than a further piece of evidence, namely, the blessings of the peace of Augustus, to correct this disesteem of the gods: enlightened minds will then understand that the civil wars themselves had a providential role and brought about the return of the Age of Gold. But the damage is done. The heirs of two generations of wounded minds and consciences will not regain the firm confidence of their great ancestors, and the Restoration, the work of antiquarians and men of letters, will not affect them.

The most interesting and probably the most useful course, since from here on Rome is the stake played for in a series of rough contests, is to observe some of the contestants, Marius and Sulla, Pompey and the astonishing Caesar, in their religious practice and plans—which sometimes foreshadow those of the emperors.

9. P. Jal, "Sur les conséquences des guerres civiles à Rome," *REL* 39 (1961): 51-52 (with a summation of the discussion).

Born of poor and obscure parents in the neighborhood of Arpinum, Marius, a latecomer to Rome, had known the plain and temperate life of the early Romans. He scorned Greek literature, and found it absurd to learn the language of an enslaved country. A brave and able soldier, he was thrust into political ambitions by an imprudent word of Scipio, under whom he made his military debut at the siege of Numantia. As happens with men who go into politics without being cut out for that career, he was at first awkward and shortly became savage and cruel. As for religion, he doubtless provides a good example of what it was in the provincial towns at the end of the second century: superstitions, infatuation with all kinds of divination, and belief in omens, with a certain knack of utilizing them. Marius established no important foundation, and no particular cult can be ascribed to him, but his life is filled by a preoccupation with signs whose directions he followed, generally with success, and which he delighted in narrating, so much so that he was sometimes suspected of being more crafty than credulous. The spiritual debasement of the times can be measured if one compares with the great scenes of Hannibal's time, when the energy of the Romans made up for and dignified their naiveté, the pages in which Plutarch describes Rome and Marius's camp on the eve of his great battle against the Teutones. His soldiers are eager for battle, but he holds them back, not giving them his real reason for doing so, not telling them of his fear that they might panic when confronted by such an unfamiliar foe (Plut. *Mar.* 17.1-10):

Marius was delighted to hear of such expressions, and tried to calm the soldiers down by telling them that he did not distrust them, but in consequence of certain oracles was awaiting a fit time and place for his victory. And indeed he used to carry about ceremoniously in a litter a certain Syrian woman, named Martha, who was said to have the gift of prophecy, and he would make sacrifices at her bidding. She had previously been rejected by the senate when she wished to appear before them with reference to these matters and predicted future events. Then she got audience of the women and gave them proofs of her skill, and particularly the wife of Marius, at whose feet she sat when some gladiators were fighting and successfully foretold which one was going to be victorious. In consequence of this she was sent to Marius by his wife, and was admired by him. As a general thing she was carried along with the army in a litter, but she attended the sacrifices clothed in a double purple robe that was fastened with a clasp, and carrying a spear that was wreathed

with fillets and chaplets. Such a performance as this caused many to doubt whether Marius, in exhibiting the woman, really believed in her, or was pretending to do so and merely acted a part with her.

The affair of the vultures, however, which Alexander of Myndus relates, is certainly wonderful. Two vultures were always seen hovering about the armies of Marius before their victories, and accompanied them on their journeys, being recognized by bronze rings on their necks; for the soldiers had caught them, put these rings on, and let them go again; and after this, on recognizing the birds, the soldiers greeted them, and they were glad to see them when they set out upon a march, feeling sure in such cases that they would be successful.

Many signs also appeared, most of which were of the ordinary kind; but from Ameria and Tuder, cities of Italy, it was reported that at night there had been seen in the heavens flaming spears, and shields which at first moved in different directions, and then clashed together, assuming the formations and movements of men in battle, and finally some of them would give way, while others pressed on in pursuit, and all streamed away to the westward. Moreover, about this time Bataces, the priest of the Great Mother, came from Pessinus announcing that the goddess had declared to him from her shrine that the Romans were to be victorious and triumphant in war. The senate gave credence to the story and voted that a temple should be built for the goddess in commemoration of the victory; but when Bataces came before the assembly and desired to tell the story, Aulus Pompeius, a tribune of the people, prevented him, calling him an impostor, and driving him with insults from the rostra. And lo, this did more than anything else to gain credence for the man's story. For hardly had Aulus gone back to his house after the assembly was dissolved, when he broke out with so violent a fever that he died within a week, and everybody knew and talked about it.

The Senate, which hardly counts for anything any more, at least remains fairly loyal to its religious tradition. It refuses to admit the Eastern Sibyl to its session. When it learns of a prophecy by the *Magna Mater* which might lessen public fears, it accepts it without making any investigation and orders a temple to be built. Even though Plutarch does not specifically say so, we may believe that before making this decision, the Senate consulted the *decemviri sacris faciundis*. But in all other respects, what a falling off! The very presence in Rome of this female fortune-teller, her impudence in applying to the Senate, the forbearance shown by the city police, and above all the

provision which Marius makes for her, sincere or otherwise, during his fourth consulate are so many scandals. Can this noisy hanger-on be imagined in the retinue of a Fabius or a Scipio? The behavior of the priest from Pessinus, who had doubtless come to Rome for other reasons and merely seized this opportunity to please the masters of the world, is that of a true Easterner, but, impostor or not, what gall to wish to address the assembly of the people! And on the part of the tribune, what disrespect to reject so insultingly an oracle which has just been accepted by the Senate! There are other examples of this change in religious behavior: after the defeat of the Teutones and Cimbri, the rejoicing Romans said that when they celebrated the occasion in their own homes, with their wives and children, they would always make their libations and offerings in honor of "the gods and Marius" (Plut. *Mar.* 27.8).¹⁰

L. Cornelius Sulla¹¹ is of a different origin and a different stamp. His family belonged to the most authentic patriciate, but he had a poverty-stricken youth, which he spent in the pursuit of pleasure, forming attachments with both boys and women; he was rescued from this poverty by two timely inheritances, one from an extremely wealthy courtesan who had fallen in love with him, and the other from his stepmother, who loved him as if he were her own son.

His career opened in Africa, where he served as quaestor under Marius. The skillful negotiations which put Jugurtha into his hands aroused his ambitions. Flattering some, bribing others, unscrupulous but not uncouth, he quickly became praetor, and the rest of his career followed in due course to its well-known climax.

The religion of this would-be monarch is more complex, more analytical than that of Marius. Like Marius—and perhaps this was the most stable element in the religiosity of the times—Sulla firmly believes in prophecies, in dreams, and in portents involving himself, and he utilizes them for his own glorification. Plutarch writes (*Syll.* 6.8–10):

... in the dedication of his Memoirs to Lucullus, he advises him to deem nothing so secure as what the divine power enjoins upon him in his dreams.

10. An important work on Marius's religiosity and religious politics has just been published, which may cause an appreciable modification of the opinion expressed in this text: J. C. Richard, "La Victoire de Marius," *MEFR* 77 (1965): 69–86.

11. On Sulla, J. Carcopino, *Sylla ou la monarchie manquée* (1931).

And he relates that when he was dispatched with an army to the Social War, a great chasm in the earth opened near Laverna, from which a great quantity of fire burst forth and a bright flame towered up towards the heavens; whereupon the soothsayers declared that a brave man, of rare courage and surpassing appearance, was to take the government in hand and free the city from its present troubles. And Sulla says that he himself was this man, for his golden head of hair gave him a singular appearance, and as for bravery, he was not ashamed to testify in his own behalf, after such great and noble deeds as he had performed.

At the decisive moment of his career, when he is marching on Rome from Nola at the head of six legions, Sulla hesitates. First he makes a sacrifice which announces his victory, but he reaches a decision only at the urgings of the bloody Cappadocian goddess Mâ, who appears to him in a dream (*Plut. Syll.* 9.5-7). Throughout his life he makes up his mind in this way, on the basis of the most reliable omens. Shortly before his death, trusting a premonitory dream, he hastens to wind up his affairs, and even has a dishonest quaestor strangled (*ibid.* 37.1-4). All the same he follows the ancient ritual regulations, and there is no reason to believe that he does so without faith in them, although he uses even these actions for his own propagandistic purposes. Again according to Plutarch (35.1-4):

On consecrating the tenth of all his substance to Hercules, Sulla feasted the people sumptuously, and his provision for them was so much beyond what was needed that great quantities of meats were daily cast into the river, and wine was drunk that was forty years old and upwards. In the midst of the feasting, which lasted many days, Metella lay sick and dying. And since the priests forbade Sulla to go near her, or to have his house polluted by her funeral, he sent her a bill of divorce, and ordered her to be carried to another house while she was still living. In doing this, he observed the strict letter of the law, out of superstition; but the law limiting the expense of the funeral, which law he had himself introduced, he transgressed, and spared no outlays. He transgressed also his own ordinances limiting the cost of banquets, . . .

But Sulla had higher ambitions. He clearly understood how much personal power could be derived either from the oldest religious tradition or from innovations which seemed to have a promising future. J. Carcopino has pointed out¹² the policies which Sulla followed to acquire exclusive possession of the auspices, not the ordinary

12. *Ibid.*, pp. 88-93.

auspices, belonging to the consuls or the tribunes, which might be set against one another by informed politicians, but a kind of absolute auspices. In 86 his *aurei*, bearing the image of the shepherd's crook, identify him as the head augur, in the style of Romulus; returning from the East, he has the Senate grant him the office of augur; in 82 the *lex Valeria* allows him to modify the *pomerium*, that venerable line traditionally subject to the taking of auspices; a year later a law affecting the administration of the provinces deprives the governors of all their personal rights to take auspices. "This," says Carcopino, "was a declaration in the language of the traditional liturgy that in the whole world there could be only one lawful leader, because in all the world there was only one irrefutable interpreter of the will of the gods, on which, from time immemorial, the Roman state had relied." After Caesar's death, Octavius will take inspiration from this profound view, and in the concentration of powers which characterizes the typical *princeps* the confiscation of the auspices will not be forgotten. Nor was it by chance that Sulla assayed, or outlined, the two devotions to Apollo and Venus which helped to give the Empire its religious dignity and originality (Plut. *Syll.* 29.10):

There is also a story that Sulla had a little golden image of Apollo from Delphi which he always carried in his bosom when he was in battle, but that on this occasion [the decisive battle at the Porta Collina in 82] he took it out and kissed it affectionately, saying: "O Pythian Apollo, now that thou hast in so many struggles raised the fortunate Cornelius Sulla to glory and greatness, can it be that thou hast brought him to the gates of his native city only to cast him down there, to perish most shamefully with his fellow-countrymen?"

In fact, no less than a miracle was needed to keep this moment from being Sulla's last. But it was not Jupiter Stator who saved this latter-day Romulus; it was Apollo, and the Pythian Apollo.

It is interesting to contrast this ostentatious devotion with what can only be called the shameless pillage of the treasure of Delphi, where Sulla's little statue came from. At the time, Sulla was vigorously prosecuting the war against Athens, which was then under the sway of the tyrant Aristion. Plutarch says (12.4-7):

And since he needed much money also for the war, he diverted to his uses the sacred treasures of Hellas, partly from Epidaurus, and partly from Olympia, sending for the most beautiful and most precious of the offerings there.

He wrote also to the Amphictyons at Delphi that it was better to have the treasures of the god sent to him; for he would either keep them more safely, or, if he spent them, would restore as much. And he sent Caphis, the Phocian, one of his friends, with the letter, bidding him receive each article by weight. Caphis came to Delphi, but was loth to touch the sacred objects, and shed many tears, in the presence of the Amphictyons, over the necessity of it. And when some of them declared they heard the sound of the god's lyre in the inner sanctuary, Caphis, either because he believed them, or because he wished to strike Sulla with superstitious fear, sent word to him about it. But Sulla wrote back jocosely, expressing his amazement that Caphis did not understand that singing was done in joy, not anger; his orders were therefore to take boldly, assured that the god was willing and glad to give.

Plutarch is astonished, along with Caphis. However, Sulla was probably not acting impiously, and probably he was not "making fun" of Caphis in his reply. His action was in the direct tradition of Roman behavior toward the gods of enemy peoples: the surest honor that Rome could do them was to annex them, along with their belongings. Had not all of Greece just revolted at the call of Mithridates, and had it not yielded immediately, with the exception of Athens, at the arrival of Sulla? Sulla was merely practicing a modernized form of *evocatio*: the little statue of Apollo which he piously preserved and which became his guardian plays the same role as the Juno of Veii who was respectfully carried to Rome, while her temple, along with the whole town, was turned over to pillage; and the interpretation that he places on Apollo's song has the same meaning as that which Camillus's well-washed young soldiers ascribed to a tremor of the statue that they were carrying: "She agrees!" Moreover, we know well enough Sulla's respect for the sacred in time of battle. His invocation to Pythian Apollo could not have been cynical and sacrilegious: thus he must have truly believed that the god of Delphi had cheerfully agreed to be despoiled and to emigrate, in the guise of the little statue, to Sulla's country. But the very comparison of the old ritual with this individualistic behavior is instructive: the beneficiary of the performance is no longer the city of Rome, it is Sulla, in whom the city is embodied and personalized, and at the same time the piety of the Roman leader is satisfied by a little figurine, with all the rest of the temple's wealth going to fill the last needs of the war.

The great makers of history, both the devout and those who were not troubled by beliefs or scruples, have never doubted their luck, or their star. At least until his seventh consulate, Marius was sustained by this simple faith. Caesar will boldly entrust his fortune to a ferryman. Sulla was no less sure of himself but, perhaps more than the others, he made his assurance plain. In 82, returning triumphantly from the East, he bestowed upon himself the surname of *felix* in a solemn proclamation. At the moment of his death—for he had the exceptional good luck of dying in bed—he recalled that the Chaldean soothsayers had predicted that his life would end at the very peak of happiness, ἐν ἀκμῇ τῶν εὐτυχημάτων. The Romans, or at least one Roman woman, knew how to move the dictator. Valeria, the young and beautiful patrician divorcee whom he married after Metella's death, made his acquaintance cleverly: at a gladiatorial spectacle, she passed behind the official seats and plucked a thread from Sulla's garment, excusing herself with these words: "I too want to share a little in your felicity."

But Sulla did not associate the surname which he chose for himself with Fortuna, or even with a personified Felicitas. And in his letters or on his trophies he did not translate it into Greek by the word εὐτυχής, but by ἐπαφρόδιτος: he embodied his good luck in Venus, a rising goddess. Robert Schilling ingeniously traces the development of this devotion or this policy:¹³ *aurei* struck in 86, after the capture of Athens, the obverse of which portrays a crowned head of Venus and the reverse an augur's staff between two trophies; an encomium in Greek verses of an oracle reminding Sulla that Venus has given power to the Aeneades, and bidding him offer an axe to the Aphrodite of Aphrodisias in Caria; an encomium in Sulla's own Greek verses accompanying his gift to the goddess; a new minting of coins portraying Venus after his return from Greece in 82; and finally, the (probable) raising of a temple to Venus *Felix*. Was the link between

13. *La religion romaine de Vénus* (1954), pp. 280–95, where all the documents are analyzed. G. C. Picard, *Les trophées romains* (1957), all of chap. 3, "Les imperatores épaphrodités"; on *felicitas*, pp. 168–70, 172–73, 185, 191, 202; J. P. V. D. Balsdon, "Sulla Felix," *JRS* 41 (1951): 1–10, who reduces to almost nothing the official manifestations of Sulla's devotion toward the Roman Venus (not without exaggeration as far as coinage is concerned), emphasizes Sulla's connection with the Oriental Aphrodite: "For a Sullan cult of Aphrodite in the East on the other hand, there is plenty of evidence to be found." But how could Sulla have thus made such a division in his mind, in a time when any Roman saying "Venus" thought "Aphrodite," and vice versa?

Sulla and the Aphrodite of Aphrodisias, probably suggested to the oracle by Sulla's friends, a replica of certain actions taken by Marius with respect to the Great Mother of Pessinus? In any case, it created permanent ties between the Carian city and Rome, from which both parties derived an advantage: Rome obtained a new religious base in the East, and Aphrodisias, favored by Caesar and Augustus, won the privilege of remaining a free and tax-exempt city.¹⁴ Thus, after making use of this cult for his own advancement, the dictator bequeathed to his unknown heirs an opportunity which they did not neglect.¹⁵

Even if we resist Lucan's eloquent idealization of Pompey's character, as we should do, it nevertheless commands our sympathy. With all its weaknesses and bad points, his was a worthy life, devoted to what at the time could pass for the noblest cause. Cato's strict favor, Cicero's devotion, and all those men of goodwill, those oldsters without personal ambition who rallied to him before Pharsalus, are valid warranties before the bar of history. Not by genius, but by moral strength, he dominates his rival Caesar, and Sulla as well, on whose behalf, during his youth, he was for a while harsh, if not cruel. In his relations with the gods he seems to have maintained the same attitude as in his life as a citizen. It is remarkable that Plutarch, in one of the longest biographies of his collection, scarcely speaks of Pompey's religion. Not that this hero had none; it was merely regular and traditional. There are no prophetesses, no sensationally proclaimed devotions. In contrast with other ambitious men, he does not

14. L. Robert, "Inscriptions d'Aphrodisias," *AC* 35 (1966): 377-432, esp. p. 415, n. 1 (at the end of p. 416).

15. Sulla contributed toward the introduction to Rome of a strange Cappadocian divinity, Mâ, with a violent cult. The Greeks had interpreted her in various ways, among others as Enyo and as Athena, and the Romans assimilated her to Bellona, who deserved better. Mâ's great success seems to have started with a vision which Sulla had. On the eve of his march on Rome he was still hesitating, despite favorable entrails: after inspecting the victim, the sacrificing priest stretched out both his hands to him and asked to be put in chains and kept a prisoner until after the battle, agreeing to be put to death if Sulla did not enjoy a speedy and complete success. But during the next night Sulla saw in a dream the Cappadocian Bellona putting a thunderbolt into his hands; she told him to hurl it against his enemies, whom she named one by one, and all those who were struck by it fell down and vanished. Only then did he decide to attack the city, which was held by Marius and Sulpicius (Plut. *Syll.* 9.6-7). It was probably also in Sulla's time that the cult of Isis made its first discreet entry into Rome (Latte, p. 282). On two important undertakings by Sulla (revision of the Sibylline Books; *lex Cornelia* concerning the priesthoods), see below, pp. 605 and 587; cf. J. Gagé, *Apollon Romain* (1955), pp. 421-44 ("Sylla et le nouveau sibyllinisme romain").

seem to have believed that he was specially marked out by Fortune. Too quickly intoxicated by success when all Italy renders him homage, he is no less quickly brought back to reality, and like any ordinary mortal he falters and consults the wise men. Between his defeat and the deplorable and courageous end awaiting him on the shores of Egypt, he has occasion, while passing through Mytilene, to talk about Providence with Cratippus, a local philosopher: he does so with bitterness and with fashionable skepticism.

Nevertheless he retains a streak of devotion toward Venus, perhaps inspired by Sulla's models. But he has the taste not to qualify her as *Felix* any longer.¹⁶ After the defeat of Mithridates, his Venus is *Victrix*: in 55, during his second consulate, he dedicated a temple to her, above his magnificent theater; at the very most, on the same day, and quite near to this temple, a shrine was dedicated to *Felicitas*, as well as another (and this is significant) to *Honos* and *Virtus*.¹⁷

In the cult itself, Pompey lacks the insolent assurance of a Sulla. Schilling has given a fine, moderate picture of Pompey's religious failure. On the night before Pharsalus, he has a dream: he sees himself going into the theater at Rome amid the plaudits of the people, and offering all sorts of spoils of war to adorn the temple of Venus *Victrix*. His friends read into this dream only a promise of victory, but it causes him to reflect: there are two ways of giving spoils to a divinity; although the victor offers them, it is the vanquished who provides them. Recalling that his opponent Caesar, as a descendant of Aeneas, has a better claim to the protection of Venus, Pompey thinks that the dream is rather a notice of his defeat. Plutarch halts his account at this point, but Appian completes it: at the decisive moment when the two opposing generals give their watchwords, it is Caesar who says *Venus Victrix*, while Pompey improvises *Hercules inuictus*. "In this religious rivalry," Schilling concludes, "Pompey must have confessed defeat beforehand when he confronted Caesar." He did so, as he did everything in these final weeks of his life, with melancholy and moderation.

Doubtless it is doing Caesar an injustice to include him in this list of politicians: his personality, his intelligence, his talents, and his

16. Schilling, pp. 296-301: on Pompey's "religious failure," pp. 299-301.

17. This is what one infers from the *Fasti Amiterni* and *Allitani* (CIL, I² 244, 217): Schilling, p. 298.

achievement go beyond any ordinary classification. But it is as forerunner of the Empire that we must consider him here. In his life, especially as it is recorded by Suetonius's mordant stylus, there is no lack of traits which, if they were reported of a modern, would certify him as a complete unbeliever. This would probably be a mistake. Caesar is merely sharing in the religious disorder of his time. The strict Roman tradition, debased in the civil wars, more and more reduced to mere formalism, had always left room for maneuvering at the discretion, even for deceptive ends, of devout men; it gives Caesar ample opportunity, which he seizes, to serve his own worldly interests. To be sure, he seems to play with the most exalted priest-hoods which his birth and family connections made available to him. Let us reread the opening of Suetonius's *Caesar*:

In the course of his sixteenth year he lost his father. In the next consulate, having previously been nominated priest of Jupiter, he broke his engagement with Cossutia, a lady of only equestrian rank, but very wealthy, who had been betrothed to him before he assumed the gown of manhood, and married Cornelia, daughter of that Cinna who was four times consul, by whom he afterwards had a daughter Julia; and the dictator Sulla could by no means force him to put away his wife. Therefore besides being punished by the loss of his priesthood, his wife's dowry, and his family inheritances, Caesar was held to be one of the opposite party.

As early as 63 Caesar intrigues for and wins the position of *pontifex maximus*, under conditions and by means leaving no doubt of the somehow strategic importance which he assigned to this office in his career (Plut. *Caes.* 7.1; Suet. *Caes.* 13). But we must not forget that for a long time the post of *pontifex maximus* had been subject to this kind of cabal and corruption, and that the *flamonium Jouis* seemed to be no more than a strange and embarrassing archaism, which could not even find a taker.

Like all his contemporaries, Caesar is inclined to believe in signs, premonitions, and oracles, though never to the point of abandoning a well-thought-out undertaking because of them. Suetonius even states peremptorily that no religious scruple, no *religio*, ever made him abandon or alter a project (59), but he offers hardly any support for this statement: he only says that once, at the sacrifice before Caesar launched his attack on Scipio and Juba, the victim escaped the knife; but he paid no heed to this ill omen and marched off at once. Else-

where (303) he mentions Caesar's momentary fears that he might be called to account for everything he had done during his first consulship *aduersus auspicia legesque et intercessionones*. But how important are these stories? The "little history" used the same anecdotes for very divergent purposes. For instance, Suetonius (77) cites the following fact, among his examples of *arrogantia*: once, when a soothsayer reported, as an unlucky portent (*tristia*), that a sacrificial beast had been found to have no heart, Caesar replied that he would make the entrails favorable (*laetiora*) when he pleased, and that a beast lacking a heart should not be regarded as a prodigy; now, Plutarch (63.1), in his account of the same disturbing portent, places it on the eve of the Ides of March and does not have Caesar say a single word about it. Before crossing the Rubicon, before "casting the die," says Plutarch (32.4), Caesar deliberated for a long time in profound silence, and then consulted his friends; once he had reached his decision, even a frightful dream, in which he saw himself in bed with his mother, could not deter him from it; now, this same dream is reported on an entirely different occasion by Suetonius (7.2), who makes it quite the opposite of a terrible warning: at the beginning of his career, in Spain, Caesar dreamed that he was raping his own mother, and the *coniectores* greatly encouraged him by their interpretation of it, namely, that he was destined to conquer the earth, our universal mother. As for the sign which preceded the crossing of the Rubicon, Suetonius too makes it quite different, and favorable (32): a man of extraordinary size and beauty was suddenly seen by Caesar, sitting at some distance and playing the flute. Some shepherds and the soldiers at nearby stations gathered around to listen. As there were some trumpeters among them, the apparition seized the instrument belonging to one of them, ran down to the river, blowing *ingenti spiritu*, and crossed over. Caesar exclaimed, "Let us follow whither the prodigies of the gods and the treachery of my enemies beckon us! *Jacta alea est* . . ." Whom are we to believe? In the strictest tradition of the holy King Numa, Caesar takes sacred things at face value and adapts them to suit his fancy. Does he fall to the ground while disembarking from his ship? He turns this unfavorable omen into a favorable one and exclaims, "Africa, I have tight hold of you!" (Suet. 59); but this too had good *auctores*: in all times the reversal of the *omina* had been achieved by presence of

mind. Pursuing Cato and Scipio in Africa, he learns while landing that his enemies have been heartened by an ancient oracle which promises that the Scipio family will always be victorious in Africa; immediately he takes from the ranks a wretched good-for-nothing named Scipio Salutio who is a member of the Scipio family, and in every engagement places him at the head of the army, as if he were the general (Plut. 52.2; Suet. 59). Caesar's somehow deliberate acceptance of the idea of death, despite all the signs predicting it for him, raises another problem; its solution probably lies in two sayings attributed to him by Plutarch. Returning to Rome after his victory over the last of Pompey's followers in Spain, he refuses to take precautions for his safety. "Better to die once," he says, "than to live in constant fear of death" (Plut. 57.3). On the very eve of his assassination, as he is dining with Lepidus, the guests raise this question: "What is the best kind of death?" Before anyone else can answer, Caesar cries out, "The kind that is least expected" (Plut. 63.2). Perhaps this man whom the passion for glory had consumed was tired of life; ever since ancient times some authors have thought so.

More ambitious than all the others, not only did Caesar believe in his star, but he felt that he was favored by the individual gods and by the whole divine world, whatever might be the meaning, which doubtless varied with the circumstances and the stages of his life, that his Roman blood and Greek education assigned to these words. Finally, as a man of action, he was fully aware of the futility of speculation. In his *Commentaries*, for example, when he speaks of the religion of the Gauls and the Germans, there is not one word to indicate that he was a freethinker or to suggest that he had any reservations concerning the idea of divinity. During the Gallic war, although he sacks the *fana templaque deum donis referta*, he does so in the approved Roman tradition: Rome did not feel obliged to extend a polite invitation to all the enemy gods. After Pharsalus, when he lands in Asia, we are pleased to see him grant liberty to the Cnidians, "for the sake of Theopompus, the author of a collection of fables" (Plut. 48.1); no doubt Caesar esteemed this man as a colleague, since he himself had not scorned to write of the *Laudes Herculis* (Suet. 56.7). These are the guidelines one must follow if one is to understand Caesar's rather erratic behavior in religious matters.

Did he believe in the Aeneas legend, which gave him Venus as a

grandmother?¹⁸ Probably so: he had no reason to make philosophical criticisms of a generally accepted topic which was so useful to him. At any rate, he exploited this unusual ancestry to its utmost limits. In 68, in his funeral speech for his aunt Julia, the widow of Marius, he was not afraid to salute the memory of the tribune, even though it was a period of total "de-Marianization." Here he revealed his pretensions fully: "My aunt Julia," he said, "is descended through her mother from the kings; through her father, she is related to the immortal gods" (Suet. 6.1). In the hours before Pharsalus, he worships Venus. Appian (B.C. 2.68) shows Caesar sacrificing at midnight to Mars and to his grandmother Venus, and vowing to raise a temple to Venus Victrix after his victory. Suddenly a streak of fire bursts from his camp and shoots across to Pompey's camp, where it goes out. Caesar accepts this as the goddess's favorable reply, and on the morning of 9 August 48, which is to seal his absolute power in blood, he hurls his troops into battle with the cry of *Venus Victrix*. In victory he fulfills his vow, but with a significant change of title: it is *Venus Genetrix* to whom he raises a marble and gold temple in the sumptuous Forum which he presents to the city and in front of which his own statue was placed later.

Nor does he neglect the other god whom he invoked before Pharsalus, and who was the patron of one of the arts in which he excelled. Among other great projects, he conceived the plan of building the largest temple in the world in honor of Mars; for this purpose he intended to fill in and level the lake in which he had staged sham naval battles (Suet. 44.1). He did not have time to complete this project, and it was Augustus who realized Caesar's pious wish by building a temple to Mars Ultor. As for Jupiter, it was to him that Caesar sent the royal crown which Mark Antony once tried to place on his head, and which was too unenthusiastically acclaimed by the bystanders for him to accept it. Caesar knew his theology.¹⁹

More important are two religious creations of which he was the occasion and certainly the inspirer. On the one hand, his very real moderation in victory, and the numerous pardons which he granted won him an honor which nobody would have dreamed of giving

18. Schilling, pp. 301-16.

19. J. Carcopino, "La royauté de César et l'empire universel," in *Points de vue sur l'impérialisme romain* (1934), pp. 89-105.

to Marius or Sulla: it was decided that a temple should be raised to his Clemency, *Clementia Caesaris* (Plut. *Caes.* 57.2; App. *B.C.* 2.106). The goddess and the hero were portrayed stretching out their hands to each other in this temple. On the other hand, he was deified in his own lifetime.²⁰ He had made early preparations for this theocratic evolution of his power by using the mythical ancestry of the Julii and by referring to Providence his undertakings and successes, before the Rubicon as well as at Pharsalus. Following Sulla's example, he was careful to secure the mystical power of the augurate, with its Romulean overtones, combining it in 47 with the office of the *pontifex maximus*. In the following year, returning from his campaign in Africa, he celebrated a triumph in which the temporary deification of the victorious general took on an entirely new dimension. "In his epic triumph of 46," writes J. Carcopino, "he shows the contemplative and serious deportment of an earlier age, and ascends the steps to the Capitol on his knees, like the pilgrims at the *Scala Santa*. His fervor may have been sincere. On the pediment of the shrine, below the names of the Triad, glittered his own name, replacing that of Catulus, which had been hammered away. In the *cella*, facing the divinities of the city, were placed his chariot and a bronze statue which showed him standing on top of the world; the pedestal of this statue bore the dedication tendered to him by the Senate: *To Caesar the demigod, ἡμιθεός* in Dio's Greek, in Latin *heros* or *semideus*. Wrapped in prayer, Caesar could affect not to see these things: he was prostrated before the symbols of his own glory." From here on things move rapidly: the establishment of the third brotherhood of Luperci, that of the Julii; a golden throne in the Senate and the tribunal; a sacred chariot and litter for the processions in the Circus Maximus—in short, says Suetonius (*Caes.* 76.1), he had "temples, altars, statues close to those of the gods, a *puluinar*, a *flamen*, a new college of Lupercals, and a month, July, named after him."

Caesar's kinship with Venus facilitated this advancement.²¹ An inscription at Ephesus tells us that in 48 the province of Asia had proclaimed him "visible god, son of Ares and Aphrodite," thus pairing his grandmother with his patron god, in the Greek style. Says Carcopino:

20. J. Carcopino, *César*, in *Histoire générale* of G. Glotz, 2d ed., 1, pt. 2 (1950): 1037-40.

21. Schilling, p. 318, n. 4.

From then on, having everything that belongs to a god, Caesar took on the title of god. In Italy itself, ordinary individuals, in a transport of gratitude, had this title engraved on stone on their own initiative. Such was the citizen of Nola who was named duumvir of his community through the grace of Caesar, and could find no better way of thanking him. The Senate officially conferred divinity upon him early in 44, and Caesar did not refuse it. In this connection Dio's testimony (44.6.4) has been suspected because he names the new god Zeus Ioulios, *Juppiter Iulius*, which would, if taken literally, exceed the limits of probability. But Dio is a Greek, and his language has only one word, *θεός*, to render *deus* and *diuus*; moreover, for him Zeus Ioulios is a euphemism for *deus*, or rather *diuus Iulius*: similarly the people of Mytilene, in the same period, called their illustrious compatriot Theophanes, on whom they had conferred divine honors, by the name of Zeus Theophanes. The people of Aesernia who consecrated their votive offerings *Genio diui Caesaris* must have done so while Caesar was still alive. In his second Philippic, delivered shortly after 19 September 44, Cicero reproaches Antony for having neglected the cult of the *diuus Iulius*; this must refer to the cult of the flesh-and-blood god, since the cult of the dead Caesar was not instituted until 42.²²

In death, Caesar once again made an opening for Roman religion which it was never to forget: the human god became a heavenly god. During the games which Augustus celebrated in honor of Venus Genetrix, "a comet was seen in the north for seven days; it rose in the sky around the eleventh hour of the day, and its brilliance was to be seen in all parts of the world. According to popular belief, this luminary proclaimed that Caesar's soul was admitted into the company of the immortal gods." In consequence, Augustus placed a star as a badge on the head of the statue of Caesar which he later consecrated in his Forum (Plin. 2.94). In literature, the *sidus crinitum* was generally replaced by a star, and in Ovid (*Met.* 15.840-42) Venus is commanded

22. From a very sizable bibliography I single out R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (1939), pp. 47-60 ("Caesar the Dictator," against Carcopino) (2d ed., 1952); A. Alföldi, "Der neue Romulus," *MH* 8 (1951): 190-215, and *Studien über Caesars Monarchie* (1952-53), *Kungliga humanistiska vetenskaps samfundet i Lund, Årsberättelse* (where the figures on the coins are skillfully utilized); J. Vogt, "Zum Herrscherkult bei Julius Caesar," *Studies Presented to D. M. Robinson* 2 (1953): 1138-40; J. Bayet, "Les sacerdoces romains et la prédivinisation impériale," *BAB* 41 (1955): 453-527; F. Taeger, *Charisma: Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Herrscherkultus* 2 (1960) (see above, p. 508, n. 15); W. Burkert, "Caesar und Romulus-Quirinus," *Historia* 11 (1962): 356-76; D. Felber, "Caesars Streben nach der Königswürde" (in two chapters: 1. "A. Alföldis 'St. ü. Caesars Monarchie'"; 2. "Die Frage der Einführung des Königtums durch Caesar") in F. Althelm, *Untersuchungen zur römischen Geschichte* 1 (1961): 211-84; P. Grimal, "Le 'bon roi' de Philodème et la royauté de César," *REL* 44 (1966): 254-85.

by Jupiter to raise the soul from the murdered heart of her grandson and to make it a star which will watch over the Capitol and the Forum forever.²³

Under these leaders who, with a greater or lesser degree of audacity and deliberate intent, oriented gods and cults to their own personal goals, what became of religion among the people and among the cultivated classes, in public and in private life?²⁴ The few soundings allowed by literary or epigraphic documentation show it greatly decayed: a priesthood but lately as charged with mystic meanings as the *flamonium* of Jupiter remains vacant for long years, while the festivals which are still celebrated are no more than entertainments. Superstition, whether Roman, Etruscan, Greek, or Eastern, is a poor substitute for the great hopes and tested techniques of ancient times. Indifference and skepticism prevent young people from having scruples, from raising problems. The intellectuals are without illusions. Some, who have no responsibilities to the state or to society, wipe the slate clean and preach atheism and free inquiry: Lucretius is the voice by which Roman thought claims its priority before all materialists to come. Cicero, divided in his mind as he was in his life, at first seems to be more highly nuanced; but these are not nuances: inside this augur-philosopher's distinguished head there is no system, but a self-conscious and accepted incoherence, with successive standpoints and spare attitudes depending on the audience or the confidant, yet all sincere, thanks to the uncertainty of each. Emile Faguet used to amuse himself by showing that Voltaire could adopt diametrically opposed views on all the great subjects, such as God and the soul, and argue them without transition, without uneasiness, and without

23. Schilling, pp. 316-23.

24. This state of expectation would be most usefully studied in a book about the Augustan restoration and the imperial religion. A few bibliographical recommendations: G. Boissier, *La religion romaine d'Auguste aux Antonins* (1874), pp. 42-72 ("La religion romaine à la fin de la République"), still useful, and the good summary by A. D. Nock, "Religious Developments from the Close of the Republic to the Death of Nero," *Cambridge Ancient History* 10 (1934): 465-511; see also W. Kroll, "Die Religiosität in der Zeit Ciceros," *Neue Jahrbücher für Wissenschaft und Jugendbildung* 4 (1928): 519-31; C. Koch, "Der altrömische Staatskult im Spiegel augusteischer und spätereipublikanischer Apologetik," *Religio* (1960), pp. 176-204 (pp. 190-99, on certain variations in Cicero). A lively and lucid reconstruction of the religious condition of the people and the magistrates in the middle of the first century B.C. is made by J. Bayer, "Les malédictions du tribun C. Ateius Capito [at the departure of Crassus for the Parthian war, 55 B.C.]," *Coll. Lat.* 45 (*Hommages à G. Dumézil*) (1960): 31-45.

duplicity, sometimes with equal passion. There was nothing Voltairean about Cicero, nor did he like such clear-cut expressions, but one feels that he is at ease in his self-contradictions, in which, perhaps, he experienced wealth and freedom, the two great intellectual pleasures. In any case, it is clear that the performance and the teachings of this upright man did not contribute toward restoring the ruined structure of beliefs and practices in the minds of weaker men. In contrast with this dilettantism is the seriousness of Varro, whose attempts at clarification and systematization have been summed up above, in my "Preliminary Remarks."²⁵ But for whom was Varro writing? For other scholars, for posterity, for history. It is unlikely that he hoped to influence the religious development of his fellow citizens, and it is certain that he did not do so. A sign of the times: in this period of general degradation, confused minds, half-scholars, and pseudo-philosophers such as the too famous Nigidius Figulus²⁶ cut a figure as thinkers, even as guides, for small groups.

It is disagreeable to have to cut short the historical curve of Roman religion at this point, at this low ebb. Let us take comfort in the thought that Augustus is close at hand, who will be able to rebuild a structure out of these ruins, following a few grand principles, around a few centers of renewed devotion. To be sure, this structure will be partly artificial, but it will be viable, and under its shelter another mutation will slowly, painfully, but surely be made ready.

25. Above, pp. 97-101.

26. On this Pythagorean senator, the friend of Cicero, who occupies a large place in J. Carcopino's book, *La basilique pythagoricienne de la Porte Majeure* (1926), see now the four combined studies in A. della Casa, *Nigidio Figulo* (1963); but L. Legrand, *Publius Nigidius Figulus, philosophe néo-pythagoricien orphique* (1930) is still worth reading; see below, p. 635.

FOURTH PART

THE CULT

I

SACRA PUBLICA

Before an acquaintance with more sumptuous cults gave their grandchildren a feeling of inferiority, the Romans could take satisfaction in their own ancient ferial. Aside from a few uneventful months, it adorned the year with rituals which lacked neither movement nor color. And how varied they were! In February, for example, before society attends to its dead, the wild Luperci provided fertility and a fine show at the same time. In March, two-horse chariot races and the clumsy dances of the Salii reinforced the purification of weapons and trumpets, and in October, symmetrically, at the end of the season for military campaigns, the rich complex of the *Equus October* was framed by the picturesque rites of purification which began, along with the month, at the postern gate of Juno Sororia. In April, the benign purifications of the Parilia, with their fires through which the celebrants jumped, followed closely the butchery of the Fordicidia. Shortly before the summer solstice, the married women gathered to act out the role of Mater Matuta and to encourage the coming Dawns. Horses and lesser animals raced in August at the Consualia. Winter began with the merry-makings of the Saturnalia. In short, everything that was later to comprise the most highly developed cult—sacrifices, dances, processions, and races—was already at hand, and not just in an ill-defined germinal state: the forms were precisely regulated in an order which came from a very remote source. As we have seen, the Fordicidia and the *Equus October* have equivalents in Vedic rituals which explain their peculiarities, while in their civil status and their activities the celebrants of the Matralia reproduce the original image of the Dawn goddess as it is given by the *Ṛg Veda*.

The essential act, the sacrifice, is done in forms which are also pre-

Roman. Although Pales, the goddess of the herds, receives only offerings of milk, just as the Vedic god of livestock in mythology and ritual eats only groats,¹ the other cults require animal victims (and this is true from the earliest times, despite what some ancient authors say), and the conditions and forms of these sacrifices again coincide with what we know from India. Save in a few exceptional rituals, the usual victims, hierarchized in the system exemplified by the *suouetaurilia*, are the ox, the sheep, and the pig, to which is added the horse on the Ides of October; with the pig replacing the goat, this is the same list of beasts which the Indian and Indo-Iranian theorists declared to be suitable for sacrifice: after man, a theoretical victim, came the horse, the ox, the sheep, and the goat. The *suouetaurilia*, reserved for Mars alone, recall not only the Greek *trittyes* but, more precisely, the sacrifice to Indra of a bull, a ram, and a he-goat. In both India and Rome there is the same demand for the physical perfection of the victim, and the same need for assurance that it will answer the requirements of the ceremony, right down to its entrails. In both India and Rome, in contrast with Greek practice, the portion allotted to the gods is reduced to a few vital organs, burned in the special sacrificial fire. In short, the first settlers of the Palatine, the Esquiline, and the Quirinal did not have to invent the bulk of their religious practice any more than they did their pantheon: they had inherited them, and the remainder was formed in the line of this tradition, down to the period of widespread borrowings from Etruria and Greece.

With this reminder, it is basically the cult of republican Rome which we shall observe, not in its completion, since it is never completed, but in the equilibrium which it achieved for a short time after the Second Punic War: by then the principal elements are brought together and perhaps hardened by centuries of pontifical guidance. A few indications, wherever they are possible, will locate these facts in relation to their past, and a few insights into their future will be opened up.²

The first distinction is that between the *sacra publica*—that is, the sacred rites which are performed for the benefit and to fill the needs

1. "QII. 4 ('Pūṣan édenté')," *Coll. Lat.* 44 (*Hommages à L. Herrmann*) (1960): 315-19.

2. In all that follows, unless there is a contrary indication, I adhere to the doctrine of Wissowa, pp. 380-479.

either of Rome as a whole or of its official divisions (*curiae*, *pagi*, etc.)—and the *sacra priuata*, those which are performed for and by individuals, the *gentes*, and unofficial bodies. The state is not uninterested in the private cults; it recognizes their usefulness. It sometimes intervenes even in the gentilitial cults and guarantees their maintenance, either when the family is about to die out or when the cost of the ceremonies has become excessive. It controls them as well, taking care that they do not disturb the order or impede the exercise of the national cult. Finally its specialists provide consultations on request as to the advisability or the performance of sacred acts. Nevertheless the two are widely separated. The *priuatus* who is delinquent in his religious duties, who becomes *impius*, is no more liable to penalty than the perjurer: it is a matter between him and the gods. At most the magistrate of morals, the censor, has power to demote him: Cato did this when he deprived L. Veturius of his horse, *quod tu, quod in te fuit, sacra stata sollemnia capite sancta deseruisti* (Fest. p. 434 L²). It is true that the state may entrust a cult having public interest to a *gens*, or leave it in the care of a *gens*; but this kind of delegation of authority does not create an intermediate or mixed category. The *sacra priuata* of the *gens* are not to be confused with the *sacra* it administers for the state.

In the private domain as well as on the state's behalf, the greater part of the sacred rites are performed at stated times or on stated occasions, because the *ius sacrum* so requires. Others are improvised, in standard forms to be sure, but to answer new needs and on the initiative of the man or men qualified to make such a decision. This second group of rites enriches the first: many acts performed in this way for particular occasions became part of regular practice.

One of the principal devices used in these innovations is the *uotum*, a solemn and generally conditional promise:³ if the divinity addressed grants a certain benefit, either immediately or within a specified period of time, the *uouens* pledges the group which he legitimately represents to make an offering, celebrate a festival, or found an altar or a temple.⁴ Thus on the field of battle the general often vows

3. This contractual character of the *uotum*, which was disputed by Latte in 1950, seems to be admitted by him in 1960, p. 42.

4. H. Bardon, “La naissance d’un temple,” *REL* 33 (1955): 166–82.

a temple to a god of his choice. When an epidemic, a famine, or Hannibal's repeated victories threaten Rome's very existence, the qualified authorities make *uota quinquennalia*, promising this or that if, at the end of the next five years, the Republic of the Roman people is still preserved in health and safety (Liv. 22.10.2; 31.9.9; etc.). The *euocatio*, by which the Roman general promises a cult to the gods of the enemy if they will abandon their present worshipers, is a variety of *uotum*. The close connection between the *ius sacrum* and the *ius civile* is manifested in the expressions which define the mystical position of the man making the vow: so long as he is pledged he is *uoti reus*; if he obtains what he has asked from the god he becomes *uoti damnatus* until such time as he has paid his debt (*soluere, reddere*). If the thing promised is a temple or an object, the *uouens* will be freed from his obligation at the moment of the *dedicatio*, a kind of public delivery to the god. In private worship the *dedicatio* causes the thing given to be considered *pro sacro*, the status of which it is impious but not sacrilegious to violate; if the *dedicatio* is made in the name of the state, the thing becomes really *sacra*. An exceptional but quite interesting form of *uotum* is the *deuotio*, a rite in which the Roman general who is in trouble buys the victory which he despairs of winning by surrendering himself and the enemy army to Tellus and the *di Manes*;⁵ turning over his authority to the *pontifex maximus*, he stands on a spear placed on the ground, his head veiled and one hand on his chin, and recites the formula which pledges him; then he hurls himself on the ranks of the enemy where, unless there is an unfortunate miracle, he is killed. In this case it is evident that the price is paid, that it is forced upon the god in advance, giving the ritual a violent, compulsive, almost magical character. If the general escapes with his life, he remains *impius*, with no possibility of *piaculum*, for as long as he lives.

Another method of generating new religious acts, of a fixed type but with their details determined by circumstances, is provided by the various measures of reparation. The Romans pay close attention

5. On the formula of the *deuotio*, see above, pp. 93-96. The general may offer up one of his subordinates as a substitute for himself, but that changes nothing in the scheme of the operation. A. Namitok, "Ty lie," *Travaux du I^{er} Congrès international de Folklore*, Paris, 1937 (1938), pp. 162-65, indicates a Circassian practice which is very analogous to the *deuotio* [*T'ə Ləye* "superfluous ram"].

to whatever threatens to compromise or actually does compromise the *pax*, the *uenia deum*, which is the object of the whole cult. First of all there are the contaminations and the involuntary, often even unconscious mistakes, which are unavoidable in the ordinary course of life and the normal usage of things: these give rise, in the private as well as the public domain, to a quantity of *lustrationes*, some periodic and compulsory, others optional and occasional. They restore the relations between men and gods to a healthy basis, and consequently they are almost always accompanied by rites directed toward the future: prayers for safety, fertility, etc. There are also the prodigies, threatening and obscure warnings, at least those which the Senate retains (*suscipere*) in matters affecting the public, from the extravagant reports which are submitted for its evaluation. After consultation by qualified priests, these are the occasion for the *procuratio*, a kind of parade: a purification of the city or a part of the city. They also give rise, on the advice of the priests (generally the decemvirs, who rely on the Sibylline Books), to various traditional or entirely new ceremonies: those of 207, which we have examined above,⁶ are still renowned. Finally there are the offenses against the *ius sacrum* of which individuals or the state are aware, thus making them *impii*; these are susceptible of *piacula*, at least when they are not brazenly deliberate. A common type of fault is the defective performance of a ritual: such a ritual must be performed again (*instaurare*) and accompanied by expiatory victims, often more expensive than those of an ordinary sacrifice.

As for those who are qualified to make and keep a promise in the name of a collective body, such as the state or a *gens*, they are its natural leaders: the *paterfamilias* or the magistrates *cum imperio*. If circumstances are such that a magistrate *sine imperio* has to decide on these matters, he must, even if he is censor, ask and receive his mandate from the people (*populi iussu facere*).

The fundamental act, whether autonomous or as an integral part of more complex operations, is the offering of material goods, especially foodstuffs, for example, the first-fruits of cereal grains, beans, grapes, sweet wine, and most often an animal, which is preeminently

6. Above, pp. 481-82.

the material for the *sacrificia*.⁷ Save for the October Horse, which is set apart by the nature of the victim, the manner of killing it, and connected rites, the course of animal sacrifice is constant. Next to the altar, *ara*, which stands facing the temple, is placed the portable hearth, *foculus*, apparently symbolizing the *focus* of the sacrificer,⁸ on which are poured preliminary libations of wine and incense (*tura et uino*). After the victim, garlanded and filleted, has been led before the altar by the temple staff, the sacrificer appears, wearing his toga in the archaic style which is still called *cinctus Gabinus* and which leaves his arms free. A *praeco* orders silence, and to cover any invalidating noise, a *tibicen* begins to play. After the preliminary oblations, the sacrificer *immolat* the animal, that is, sprinkles it with wine and scatters over it the *mola salsa*, the flour of spelt, roasted and soaked in brine, which the Vestals have prepared.⁹ Then, without cutting the animal, he passes the point of the sacrificial knife over its whole body, from head to foot. We are told in the chronicle of animals, thus *immolati* and still unharmed, which managed to escape and reach the forest. In olden times the sacrificing priest carried out the operation, but in the classic ritual the actual killing of the animal is performed by specialists, the *uictimarii*. The *exta*, which constitute the god's part—liver, lungs, spleen, heart, and epiploon (according to Plin. N.H. 11.186;¹⁰ the heart, only after about 260)—are removed and put on a spit or placed in an *olla*. A few other pieces, probably recapitulating the whole body, *augmenta* and *magmenta*, are added to them.¹¹ The sacrificer places the whole offering on the altar, where the meats are burned and thus dispatched to their destination (*exta reddere, porricere*). The preparation of the *exta* is the occasion for a meticulous inspection of the arrangement and shape of the organs; if they are normal, the sacrifice follows its course (*litatio, litatum est*); but if any anomaly is noticed, the victim is declared unsuitable, the operation is annulled, and a fresh victim, called *succidanea* (Gell. 4.6.6), is sub-

7. A good discussion of the sacrifice by Latte, pp. 379–92. The fundamental work is still S. Eitrem, *Opferrius und Voropfer der Griechen und Römer* (1915); C. Krause, *De Romanorum hostiis*, Diss. Marburg (1893), is also still useful.

8. See above, p. 315.

9. See above, p. 318.

10. This is the usual interpretation of this rather obscure text; but it is possible that it is a question of the heart among the *exta*, not as they are offered in sacrifice, but as they are consulted by the haruspices; see below, p. 606, n. 14.

11. Varr. L.L. 5.112.

stituted for the defective one. The rest of the body, *viscera* ("everything between the bone and the skin," that is, the flesh, Serv. *Aen.* 6.253), is deemed *profanum*¹² and eaten, by the sacrificer and his guests in the private cult, by the priests in the sacrifices where they are officiating on behalf of the Republic.

The animals, usually taken from the three species which in combination form the *suovetaurilia*, must have certain symbolic correlations with the divinities who receive them. Following a generally observed rule, the gods desire male victims and the goddesses female. Jupiter and Juno prefer white animals, the *di Manes* and the nocturnal Summanus black ones, and Vulcan red ones; Jupiter receives gelded males,¹³ and Mars whole males. In the season when Earth is pregnant with the coming harvest, cows in calf, *fordae*, are sacrificed to her. According to circumstances, the animals chosen are full-grown, or very young but still perfect: *hostiae maiores*, *hostiae lactentes*. In times of great public distress, veritable hecatombs, and even more extensive sacrifices, are ordered: *bubus Joui trecentis* after Trasimene (Liv. 22.10.7).

Before the adoption of the calendar, that is, probably throughout the regal era and perhaps even later, we do not know what reckoning was used to apportion the festivals through the year. It is likely that the system was not appreciably different from what we know of the codified solar-lunar year in the calendar that took its name from Numa. The lunations, called by the ancient Indo-European name of *menses*, may have played a somewhat larger role in it, but as a rule the festivals were actually and mystically linked to a season of the year, and the beginning of the new course of festivals in the spring seems to be quite primitive. Once the calendar was adopted, a meticulous and subtle science was used to determine the part played in it by sacred matters.¹⁴

12. E. Benveniste, "Profanus et profanare," *Coll. Lat.* 45 (*Hommages à G. Dumézil*) (1960): 40-53.

13. "QII. 11 ('Joui tauro uerre ariete immolari non licet')," *REL* 39 (1961): 241-50.

14. Wiss., pp. 432-45. On the calendars, one must still refer to the pages which Mommsen devoted to them in *CIL*, I², 203-339, esp. pp. 283-304, but since Mommsen's time the number of inscriptions which give information about the calendar has doubled and the complete corpus of the *Fasti* is now available in A. Degraffi, *Inscriptiones Italiae* XIII, 2 (1963) (with important commentaries). On the pre-Julian calendar of Antium, published (C. Mancini) in the *NS* (1921), pp. 73-141, see G. Vaccai, *Le feste di Roma antica*,

The days are classified in two categories, *dies festi* and *profesti*, and *dies fasti* and *nefasti*, in which the ideas of *feriae* and *fas* are operative. The second category, which is metaphysical and has given rise to a number of controversies, is defined at the beginning of the present book. The *dies fasti* are those which provide man's secular activity with a mystical basis, *fas*, which assures him of the chance to be successful; the *dies nefasti* do not provide such a basis.¹⁵ The word *feriae* is only descriptive and negative. In a broad sense, the *feriae* are the times in which man renounces his secular activities and which he reserves for the gods, with or without a stated cultic act; consequently the *dies festi* are consecrated to the gods, and the *profesti* are left to men for the conduct of private and public business (Macr. 1.16.2). Such was the oldest teaching; later it was changed in various ways, for instance with *feriae* often receiving a positive content, typified by the "festival," from which the *dies festus* remained exempt—or vice versa. But these matters concerned only the theorists: in practice, almost all the *feriae*, and with them the *dies festi*, had a religious content, involving ceremonies. Therefore the two categories are quite different in principle: one (*fasti-nefasti*) defines the days from the point of view of human activity, with the direct concept being favorable to such activity; the other (*festi-profesti*) defines them from the point of view of divine ownership, with the direct concept asserting such ownership. Thus, although all *dies festi* are *nefasti*, not all *dies nefasti* are *festi*: there are other mystical reasons than

con aggiunte sul calendario anziano, *precesariano* (1927); M. P. Nilsson, "Zur Frage nach dem Alter des vorcäsarischen Kalenders," 1922, reprinted in *Opuscula selecta* 2 (1952), with an unconvincing argument, on pp. 985–87, against Agnes K. Michels, "The Calendar of Numa and the Pre-Julian Calendar," *TAPhA* 50 (1949): 320–45. The last-named author has since published an excellent study of the whole subject, *The Calendar of the Roman Republic* (1967). See also another, E. Gjerstad, "Notes on the Early Roman Calendar," *Acta Archaeologica* 32 (1961): 193–214. The illustrated calendars must also be taken into account. H. Stern drew much valuable information, even for the old religion, from such a fourth-century calendar which is preserved in several copies all derived from a lost Carolingian archetype: *Le calendrier de 354, étude de son texte et de ses illustrations* (1953). Recently a mosaic calendar was exhumed in Tunisia, on the site of ancient Thyssdrus. L. Foucher, "Découvertes archéologiques à Thyssdrus en 1961," *Notes et documents de l'Université de Tunis* 5 (1962): 30–52. H. Stern devoted several important articles to it; in addition to the two already mentioned (p. 214, n. 16, and p. 348, n. 32), "L'inscription du mois d'octobre sur une mosaïque d'el-Djem," *Cahiers de Tunisie* (Faculté de Lettres et Sciences humaines de Tunis) 45–46 (1964): 21–33.

15. Above, pp. 131–32.

respect for divine ownership which make human activity on certain days inadvisable.¹⁶

The *feriae* may be regular or exceptional, and in the latter case, they may be brought about by a vow or entailed by a *piaculum* or a *lustratio*. If they are *priuatae*, they may involve individuals (*feriae singulorum*: thus the *flamen Dialis* is *quotidie feriatus*, that is, wholly consecrated to the service of his god; his wife, the *flaminica Dialis*, is *feriata* whenever she hears thunder, and remains so until she appeases the gods; the heir of a man who has died on shipboard and has been buried at sea must, as his *piaculum*, offer a sacrifice and *ferias observare* for three days); or they may be familial (*feriae familiarum*: *dies natales, operationis, denicales*—birthdays, days of private sacrifice, or days of purification for a bereaved family, *funesta familia*, Fest. p. 348 L²); or they may concern some quite different permanent group, such as the various professional organizations, etc. If they are *publicae*, they are classified as *statiuae* (or *statae annuae*), *conceptiuae*, or *imperatiuae*: those in the third group are imposed in consequence of an unforeseen circumstance, usually the *procuratio* of a prodigy; such are the *feriae nouendiales*, which always follow a shower of stones (nine days of impurity, as for a *funesta familia*, followed by the *procuratio*). Those in the second group, almost all linked with agrarian life, are movable; they are set (*concipiuntur*) each year by the magistrates or the priests, and include the *Ambarvalia* and the *augurium canarium*. There remain the *statae annuae*, falling on a fixed day, which form the ferial of the calendars—at least those which concern the people as a whole and not one of its divisions; this limitation explains the omission of the *Septimontium* of 11 December, an old festival commemorating the unification of the *montes*.

Negatively then, the *feriae* are defined by the abstention from all worldly activity. But, whereas it was easy to suspend the business of the state, the administration of justice and military operations were more demanding, and it was impossible for the economic life of the city to be interrupted. And so a whole casuistry was developed to mitigate the rigidity of the theoretical requirements: according to

16. On the *dies fasti* and *nefasti*, see J. Paoli, "Les définitions varroniennes des jours fastes et nefastes," *Revue historique du droit français et étranger*, 4th ser. 29 (1952): 293-327, and "La notion de temps faste et de temps comitial (Varron, *De l.l.*, VI, 31 et 32)," *REA* 56 (1954): 121-49; Michels, *Calendar of the Roman Republic*, pp. 48-54 and 61-83.

Macrobius (1.16.9-10), the magistrates declared that the *feriae* would be contaminated by the performance of any *opus*; but there were exceptions. Any *opus* having some connection with religion, or of great urgency, or which it would be dangerous to omit, was allowed. Other theorists added: any *opus* which had already been started and which might be completed *sine institutione noui operis*—and this, broadly interpreted, would authorize a great many things. Another rule, noted by Macrobius in the same passage, proves that the *opus* in general was expected and tolerated. The *rex sacrorum* and the *flamines* (here meaning the *maiores*; and Servius, *Georg.* 1.268, adds the *pontifices*: thus all the highest priests) were not allowed to see an *opus* in progress during the *feriae*; and so a *praeco* went ahead of them to warn everyone to desist from work, and whoever disregarded this warning was fined.

In practice, as we have said above, the *feriae publicae* have a content of more or less complex rites, directed to one or more gods. There are sixty-one of them, *statae*, in the year: all the Ides, which are *feriae Iouis*; three of the Calends (those of March, June, and October, the last two harboring respectively the festival of Carna and the rite of the *tigillum sororium*); the Nones of July (*Nonae caprotinae*); and forty-five other festivals, designated by individual names. Their distribution has occasioned some interesting comments, originating principally with Wissowa: (1) With the sole exception of the Poplifugia on 5 July, no festival falls between the Calends and the Nones, which suggests that the classification according to the quarters of the moon is very ancient, since it is only on the Nones that the *rex sacrorum* proclaims the *feriae publicae* which will take place during the month. This proclamation, which is made on the Capitol, is undoubtedly an extension of a regal practice. (2) With the exception of the Regifugium on 24 February and the Ecurria on 14 March, all the *feriae* fall on odd days (starting from the first day of the month), a fact which suggests that their classification by days came after the adoption of the calendar (it will be noted, to judge by the second element, *-fugi-*, of these symmetrical compounds, that the rites of the mysterious Regifugium and Poplifugia implied a rupture of the political equilibrium, an irregularity, probably in order magically to prevent such a rupture: their two positions in the calendar also go against the rule). (3) As a consequence of the preceding rule, two *feriae* never follow each other

immediately; those which take up several days (such as the *Carmenalia*: 11 and 15 January) or closely linked festivals (such as the two holiday groupings of *Consus* and *Ops*: 21 and 25 August, 15 and 19 December; and the puzzling *Lucaria*: 19–21 July) are interrupted by an interval, generally lasting three days, more rarely by a single day. (4) There are some natural distributions or symmetries: the agrarian festivals of course mark out the season of rural activity; and the military festivals in October correspond in both arrangement and content with those in March, marking the natural finish and start of the season for warfare; a little-known “*agonium*” (11 December: *Sol Indiges*, *δαφνηφόρος καὶ γενάρχης*, according to *Lyd. Mens.* 4.155) is separated by exactly six months from the festival of Dawn (*Matralia*: 11 June).¹⁷ (5) Finally, certain *dies festi*, very few if one discounts a few *Ides* and *Calends*, celebrate several occasions at once (17 March: *agonium Martiale* and the *Liberalia*; 23 December, the *feriae Jouis* and the *Larentalia*).

The division into *dies fasti* and *nefasti*, though simple in principle, is complicated by subdivisions, which are marked by initials on the stone calendars; one of these initials resists all attempts at interpretation. The 235 *dies fasti* (marked F, as opposed to N), which are open for secular, and especially juridical, activity (*lege agere*), are not all open for the fundamental political activity, namely, the gathering of the people in *comitia* (*agere cum populo*); those which are, and which consequently are most readily disposable, number 192 and are called *comitiales* (marked C). But what is meant by the initials NP (N'), with which fifty-two days are marked, all of them *feriae publicae*? Despite repeated efforts, this problem has not been solved;¹⁸ the solution could probably be found in a gloss by *Festus* (p. 283 L²), if it were not so badly mutilated. In any case, pontifical practice distinguished some mixed days, parts of which were *fasti* and other

17. The meaning of some of these symmetrical locations remains unclear: why do the *Volcanalia* in August, the *Saturnalia* in December, appear in the short interval between a festival of *Consus* and a festival of *Ops*?

18. This initial is supposed to mark the *feriae publicae*: *Wiss.*, p. 438 and n. 1 (approved by *Latte*, p. 2 and n. 3); it is supposed to mean “*nefas, feriae posteriores*,” that is, later than an alleged “*ferial* of *Janus*,” but prior to the *Quirinal-Septimontium* community: *J. Paoli*, *REL* 28 (1950): 252–79 (contra: *G. Dumézil*, *RHR* 139 [1951]: 208–15; *Latte*, loc. cit.); it is supposed to designate the festivals in which the pontiffs take part: *A. Piganiol*, *Annuaire du Collège de France*, 1950, p. 200. Last of all, see *Michels*, *Calendar of the Roman Republic*, pp. 61–83, with its very sensible conclusions (NP was used to mark the *feriae publicae stativae universi populi communes, feriae publicae pro populo*).

parts *nefasti*. Eleven days called *intercisi* (marked EN: *endotercisi*) were *nefasti* in the morning and in the evening but *fasti* in the intervening period (Varr. *L.L.* 6.31); among these were eight which immediately preceded *feriae publicae*. Three days called *fissi* (Serv. *Aen.* 6.37) were at first *nefasti*, and became *fasti* only after a certain sacred operation had been performed. The calendars mark them more explicitly: Q(uando) R(ex) C(omitiauit) F(as), 24 March and 24 May; and Q(uando) ST(ercus) D(elatum) F(as), 15 June (the day when the *aedes Vestae* was cleansed of *stercus*). For no apparent reason, the distribution of *dies fasti* (and *comitiales*) and *nefasti* throughout the year is extremely uneven. September and November are almost entirely *fasti*, while half of July and two-thirds of February and April are *nefasti*.¹⁹

An altogether different category is that of the *dies religiosi*. On these days, save in cases of absolute necessity, it was recommended not to undertake any kind of public activity, secular or religious (and the latter point clearly distinguishes them from the *dies nefasti*); they were *neque praeliaries neque puri neque comitiales* (Macr. 1.16.24), unsuitable for marriage (*ibid.*), and generally for the start of any enterprise (Gell. 4.9.5). This was an experimental idea: the days thus marked with a kind of *nota infamiae* by decision of the Senate had proved historically that they were dangerous and hostile. Among them were the anniversaries of serious military defeats, Cremera and Allia (both on 18 July), and the generalization of unpleasant memories had caused all the days following Calends, Nones, and Ides (*dies atri*) to be included in this group. Because of the mystical dangers which they entailed by their very nature, there were also included the days when the earth and its nether regions, the world of the living and that of the dead, entered into communication (Parentalia and Lemuria, the three days on which *mundus patet*), as well as those days on which the talismans of Rome were aired, so to speak (from 7 to 15 June, the opening of the *aedes Vestae*; in March and October, the days on

19. It is possible that the "blank" which September constitutes is a result of the disappearance of the kingship, and hence of an important part of the festivals which were personally linked with the *rex*; it is remarkable that the only *dies nefastus* in September is the Ides, the *dies natalis* of the temple of Jupiter O.M.—*rex*—on the Capitol, and that the Calends of the month are the *dies natalis* of the temples of Juno Regina (in 392) and of two varieties of Jupiter (*Liber*, an early one; *Tonans*, under Augustus). There is apparently no explanation for November.

which the Salii publicly used the *ancilia*). All this was only an official recognition of the idea of a “bad day” (they also said *dies uitiosus*), of which modern superstitions about “Friday the thirteenth” give a hint, and which the Roman peasant was well acquainted with. As is generally the case with whatever the Romans qualified as *religiosus*, however, an actual prohibition was not involved: the Senate merely recorded and noted the fact that these days had given proof of their evil quality, but this had no effect on pontifical doctrine. This explains why the three days on which *mundus patet* (24 August, 5 October, and 8 November), as well as the *dies Alliensis*, are marked C, *comitiales*, in the calendars, and why the greater number of the *dies atri* are marked F, *fasti*.

This brief summing-up at least gives an idea of the scrupulous care with which the pontiffs and magistrates worked on the fundamental ideas in the course of the centuries. But these ideas—*fas* and *feriae*—are surely among the most archaic. Thought did nothing but refine practices and classifications which, perhaps in a less precise form, had preceded the calendar that we know.

The ceremonial content of the *feriae publicae* and *priuatae* varied widely. An essential element was sacrifice, but a number of efficacious rites were added to the basic sacrifice, enveloping it and sometimes even arousing a greater degree of public interest. Thus the circumambulatory procession of the *lustrationes*, which involved the *ager Romanus* or the land surrounding the city, had its own meaning: it marked out an invisible barrier against those invisible enemies whom the armed dances of the Salii, with their loud noises and threatening gestures, were also intended to frighten away. The chariot races (*bigae*), by developing the mystical advantages of competition, opened the campaigning season with the Ecurria, and, on the Ides of October, revealed the horse which Mars wished as a victim. Even the “festival” of the animals, the days (*Vestalia*) when they were allowed to rest, had a certain restorative force, just as the thongs of the Luperci had a fertilizing one.

In the course of the fourth century and especially of the third, when their trade, their power, and their wars in remote places forced the Romans to take notice of the wealth and breadth of Greek religious practices, this whole fantasy of national rituals seemed old-fashioned

and outdated. It was not eliminated or suppressed like the mythology: a natural and considered conservatism would not allow the abandonment of those ceremonies which had watched over the safety and growth of the city. But many of these rites had been stripped of their mythical and even of their theological justification (think of the *Matralia*). In the eyes of men whom a new knowledge was enlightening, their outmoded appurtenances and performance gave them a rather ridiculous look. Moreover, the violence of some primitive and savage ceremonies offended a taste engaged in a process of being refined. These stubbornly maintained rites satisfied the mass of the people, so readily susceptible to influences from abroad, no more than they did the governing class, torn between its loyalty to the *antiquitates*, the *origines populi Romani* (Cato is an extreme case of this), and the evident superiority of a culture coming from the south and east, which had already captivated this class on its very home ground. One might even wonder if such crude rites could still satisfy the gods on whom early *interpretationes* had conferred the civilized manners of the Olympians. It is this feeling of inadequacy which brought about the introduction of Etruscan rites and above all of the *græcus ritus* to Rome.

Actually, ever since its domination by the Etruscans, Rome had not been closed to borrowings. As we have seen, this was the case with the gods, and it was also true of the rituals. A ceremony as wholly national as the triumph came from Etruria, probably as did the word which designates it, distantly derived from the Greek;²⁰ although secularized in three-fourths of its ceremonial pomp, it still retained a trace, more or less clearly understood, of two religious ideas which were foreign to Roman soil. The victorious general who ascended the Capitol at the head of his troops, his face rouged like that of the statue, was for a few hours himself the god whose home he was going to visit; at the same time, however, the great, almost complete freedom with which his soldiers hurled gibes and insults at him had not only the "moral" value which the writers generally ascribe to it (*hominem te esse memento*), but a magical effect of protection against the invisible risks entailed by such great fortune and such an apotheosis. It is hard for us to imagine the conqueror of the Gauls riding in all his

20. For the most recent times, cf. A. Bruhl, "Les influences hellénistiques dans le triomphe romain," *MEFR* 46 (1929): 77-95.

glory along the Sacra Via, while his veterans shouted and sang that he had performed his first feat of arms in the bed of King Nicomedes, and that he had not had the best of that encounter.

This tempered mixture of extremes, deification and derision, is one of the first contributions made by the *alienigenae* to the classic picture of Rome. Plenty of others were to follow. First, the *lectisternia*. They too are probably a direct borrowing from the Etruscans, from Caere,²¹ but the Greek model (*κλίνην στρώσαι*) is obvious:²² it is a *graecus ritus*, ordered by the Books. To feed the god at the altar is the object of every sacrifice. To serve him a meal is another matter. The Romans were not unaware of this practice: the *daps*, symbolically reduced to a piece of roasted meat and a pitcher of wine, was a treat which the peasant offered to Jupiter before sowing, and which was later duplicated in the city by the *epulum* presented to Jupiter on the Capitol. But neither at the peasant's table nor on the Capitol was there any representation of the god in the act of eating: his invisible presence was enough. In contrast, the palpable presence of the god characterizes the *lectisternium*.

A cushion, *puluinar*, is the bed on which, like all the human guests, the god reclines near the table which is spread for him. And it is truly the god who thus reclines, in the guise of his cultic statue or perhaps, sometimes, a doll. The *lectisternia* were originally served outside of the temples: in this way men could see with their own eyes these protectors who were as a rule confined in a *cella*. It is not known when a god received this homage for the first time. The word enters into the literature with the triple *lectisternium* of 399, in which Apollo was paired with Latona, Hercules with Diana, and Mercury with Neptune. Apollo the healer heads the group, since the occasion for the ceremony is a devastating epidemic, and even though not everything is clear regarding the pairings, the reasons behind them are essentially Greek. Other collective *lectisternia* followed, four of them in the fourth century, according to Livy, who is echoing Piso,

21. As early as 1894 C. Pascal, "De lectisterniis apud Romanos," *RF* 22: 272-79, recalled, after Iranian and Greek parallels, the Etruscan tombs on which "mortui utpote dii coenantes pictura efficti reperiuntur"; see J. Gagé, *Apollon Romain* (1955), pp. 168-79 ("Les lectisternes, théoxénies grecques et modèles étrusques?").

22. Latte, p. 243. Cf., in Mycenaean (Pylos, Fr. 343) *te-ke-to-ro-te-ri-jo* (genitive plural): *Λεχε(ε)-σρωτηρίων*, Palmer); see L. A. Stella, *La civiltà Micenea nei documenti contemporanei* (1905), p. 237, who makes a comparison with the *lectisternium*.

before the one which gathered together the twelve great gods at a critical moment in the war with Hannibal. In these first accounts of the historian (5.13.6), the gods and goddesses all recline in the same way, *stratis lectis*. Later the goddesses are shown seated, *sellis positis*, while the gods remain in a reclining posture, and the *sellisternia* are side by side with the *lectisternia*. The *epulum Jouis* is celebrated with these differential postures; it is set in the style of the *graecus ritus*, with the Capitoline goddesses as guests (Val. Max. 2.1.2: *Jouis epulo ipse in lectulum, Juno et Minerua in sellas ad cenam inuitabantur*). As there are Greek precedents for this differentiation, some think that there is no question of an innovation here,²³ and that beds and chairs were set out for the gods and goddesses in 399, despite Livy's statement (5.13.6). But the association of a god and a goddess in two of these pairings, the third being composed of two gods, does not lend itself to this interpretation, nor does Livy's concrete description: *tribus quam amplissime tum apparari poterat stratis lectis*. A definite feature of the *lectisternia* which often characterizes the *graecus ritus* is the participation of the Roman crowds, not in their social groupings, but as an inorganic mass of individuals. They approach the gods and, if the historians are to be believed, they are invited to extend the hospitable intention of the public rites by similar ceremonies in their own homes: all doors were left open; friends and strangers alike were invited in; men were reconciled with their bitterest enemies, and even the prisoners in jail were relieved of their chains. Although we cannot accept all these details (despite the fact that the criticism leveled against them is weak), it is quite certain that there is a "spirit of the *lectisternia*," something the moderns call an *ambiance*, that is quite different from what the majority of the old national rites evoked or required.

As the *epulum Jouis* was transformed into a *lectisternium*, it is possible that this was a Roman custom which had been developed in the *supplicationes* of the *graecus ritus*.²⁴ The examples we find in the first books of Livy are naturally open to the suspicion of anachronism,

23. Latte, p. 242; L. Ross Taylor, "The *sellisternium* and the Theatrical *pompa*, *CPh.* 30 (1935): 122-30.

24. Latte, p. 245, n. 2, discussion of A. Kirsopp Lake, "The *supplicatio* and *Graecus ritus*," *Quantulacumque: Studies Presented to Kirsopp Lake* (1937), pp. 243-51 (with a list of the *supplicationes* mentioned in Livy, pp. 250-51); L. Halkin, *La supplication d'actions de grâces chez les Romains* (1953).

even when the technical term is not applied to them (e.g., 3.5.14). It is hard to imagine how the controlled, formalist religion associated the whole population, or even segments of it, in the prayers of the specialists, but it is also hard to believe that private, synchronized cultic acts did not reinforce the efforts of the priests and magistrates in times of great danger. Be that as it may, the *supplicationes* of the third century offer a new type of performance. In general, it is the consuls or the Senate who orders them, most frequently at the suggestion of the decemvirs after consultation of the Books; but in several cases, they are the result of a decree of the pontiffs or even of responses of the haruspices: like so many others, this innovation lacks the unvarying status of the old cults. The direction of the rites, or rather their opening (*praeire*), and a sacrifice which accompanies them (Liv. 37.3.6), are entrusted to the decemvirs, and sometimes *supplicationes* and *lectisternia* are performed conjointly. The city then presents an astonishing spectacle: not only at Rome, but in the country, in the neighboring towns, and later throughout all of Italy (Liv. 40.19.5), men and women are mobilized in the service of religion. As specified in a text (Liv. 40.37.3), the men over the age of twelve, garlanded and carrying laurel branches, proceed to the temples, where they offer wine and incense as in the private cult. The women, their hair let down as in the rites of mourning, kneel with their hands stretched out to heaven, “sweeping the altars with their hair” (Liv. 26.9.7). Just as all the people are invited, so all the gods, with rare exceptions, welcome them to their temples which are permanently open for this occasion; the fullest expression is *supplicatio omnibus dis quorum puluinarum Romae essent* (Liv. 24.10.13; cf. 31.8.2; 32.1.14; 40.19.5). Even more than during the *lectisternia*, Rome frees herself in this way from the rigid confines of its formalism. The prayers and the gestures are those to which each is inspired by his fear or his piety; one is reminded of the beginning of the *Oedipus Tyrannos*: “Children, young sons and daughters of old Cadmus, why do you throng these stairs? Why these suppliant branches? The town is heavy with a mingled burden of sounds and smells, of groans and hymns and incense . . .”

Another practice in which a Greek influence is apparent may have arisen from the *supplicatio*. Out of this Roman crowd addressing itself freely to the gods in words and gestures, smaller groups were some-

times selected as its representatives. The words and cries of these groups became rhythmic discourse, and at the same time their races became processions and their movements became graceful dances. These delegates of the people were its most touching and most promising members, young girls and boys, *patrimi* and *matrimi*, following the old belief that a child whose parents are still living is himself the bearer of life and fortune: in 190, for example, during a *supplicatio*, *decem ingenui decem uirgines patrimi omnes matrimique* (Liv. 37.3.6). Macrobius (1.6.14) speaks of an *obsecratio*, another name for the *supplicatio*, in which free and enfranchised young men and girls who were *patrimae* and *matrimae* recited the *carmen*. The most famous example is the *supplicatio* which took place in 207, analyzed above,²⁵ in which the verses of Livius Andronicus gave rise to the poetic genre that Horace's *Carmen Saeculare* was to immortalize. What a difference between this orderly and gracious procession and the parades of the Ambarvalia or the Robigalia, in which the priests and their helpers marched around the fields or walked to the fifth milestone on the Via Claudia!

The procession of 207 brought to the temple of Juno Regina on the Aventine two statues of the goddess carved out of cypress wood, which formed part of the *procuratio* of the prodigy. Wissowa has emphasized that this too was an innovation. For a long time the Roman temples had received gifts, many of them coming directly from spoils or prepared or bought with money from the sale of spoils, or with the money from fines, but these gifts were not the means of expiation or purification. They did not become so until the war with Hannibal: from book 21 to book 42, Livy tells of seven cases in which such gifts were offered as expiation. At the same time, the practice was established of ordering the married women, the freedwomen, or people as a whole to collect a *stips*, a sum of consecrated money to pay for an expiatory gift. Thus began a practice which had been foreshadowed by the special case of the "tithe" of Hercules at the Ara Maxima, and from which soon afterward the Magna Mater was to benefit, and then other Greek and even Roman divinities. Until that time the cult had been guaranteed by the belongings of the god or of the priestly colleges, by public allocations, or by various other means (fines, charges for admission and use, etc.); now, in these new circumstances,

25. Above, pp. 481-82.

it became a matter for faithful individuals or groups, with all the risks and dangers to both parties entailed by this "separation of religion and the state."

One of the cases in which the dominant characteristics of evolution appeared most clearly is that of the Games.²⁶ In the broad sense of the word, the early rituals include many of these activities, but without an official term classifying them as *ludi*. The public enjoyed themselves at the Compitalia, the Saturnalia, and on the unofficial but ancient day of Anna Perenna, while the expulsion by the people of Mamurius Veturius, the "old man of March," was like a little drama. The Ecurria and the Consualia presented actual races, in which there are reasons for thinking that very ancient, pre-Roman features survived, while the *lusus troiae* was probably an armed dance, on horseback, performed under the direction of *magistri* by patrician youths on 19 March and 19 October (*quinquatrus*, *armilustrum*).²⁷ But in all these activities, save perhaps in the last-named case and in a few others, the ritual meaning was dominant. The game as such, having its meaning in itself, and simply offered to the gods as a fully constituted gift, came to Rome from Etruria.

Among the earliest are the games celebrated in *honorem deorum inferorum* under the name of *ludi Taur(e)i* (Paul. p. 441 L²), in which P. Cortsen thought he recognized the Etruscan *tauru* translated (hypothetically) by "tomb."²⁸ It was claimed that they had been introduced by the last Tarquin, following the *Libri fatales* (Serv. Aen. 2.140). The calendar of Ostia indicates them as quinquennial, on 25 and 26 June, and Livy (39.22.1) speaks of them briefly for the year 186, but all that is known of them is that they were celebrated in the Circus Flaminius, and that there "horses raced around the turning-posts" (Varr. L.L. 5.154). The *di inferi* who are involved here, must have been an Etruscan representation, like the rites themselves, Romanized in some unknown form.

Also unknown is the date on which the *ludi Capitolini*, celebrated

26. A. Piganiol, *Recherches sur les Jeux romains* (1923); G. Piccaluga, *Elementi spettacolari nei rituali festivi romani* (1965) (pp. 32-52 on the meaning of *ludus*), treating, in addition to the *ludi* proper, the Ambarvalia, Robigalia, etc.

27. Wiss., p. 450; Latte, pp. 115-16, and the very good articles by K. Schneider (1927) and H. Mehl (1956) in RE 13, cols. 2059-67, and Supp. 8, cols. 888-906.

28. Latte, p. 157.

on the Ides of October, were established; some assign them to the time of Romulus, that is, to the origins, which is unlikely. According to Livy (5.50.4; 52.11), they commemorated the resistance of the hill against the Gauls in 390 and the deliverance of Rome. They were the responsibility of a *collegium Capitolinorum*, consisting of people who lived on the Capitol; wrestling matches, races, and buffooneries were put on for the entertainment of the public.

To Tarquin the Old was attributed the institution of the *ludi magni* which later became the *ludi Romani*, the most important Roman games (Liv. 1.35.9). At all events they bear an Etruscan stamp (*equi pugilesque ex Etruria maxime acciti*) and are closely associated with the cult of Jupiter on the Capitol. Analogies with the triumph, perhaps adequately explained by their common origin, were recognized by the Romans themselves, who clothed the magistrate in charge of the games in the garb of the *triumphator*; but these analogies do not authorize us to see in the two festivals the separate halves of a whole, as Mommsen and Wissowa do. The religious element was the procession which moved from the Capitoline temple, through the Forum, to the Circus, where the games took place, and where it marched past to the applause of the public (*pompa Circensis*).²⁹ Dionysius of Halicarnassus (7.72) described this procession at length, but at the same time inadequately, following Fabius Pictor. It carried the statues of the gods, of whom Dionysius and Ovid (*Am.* 3.2.43-56) give discrepant lists. The magistrate headed the parade, followed by young boys on foot and on horseback; then came the charioteers and the wrestlers who were to compete. Bringing up the rear, in a chariot with the special name of *tensa* driven by a *puer patrimus*, came the gods, and, apart from the gods, if we understand the obscure texts correctly, their *exuviae*, or distinctive attributes. Latte (p. 249, n. 2) interprets this separation, if it must be accepted, by saying that in primitive times the gods could only be represented by their attributes, and that when they began to be portrayed by statues, these were merely added to the existing ritual apparatus, without any change. The games presented *quadrigae* (not *bigae*, as in the archaic Ecurria), *desultores*, who leaped from one horse to another, wrestlers, and boxers. The gladiators, of Etruscan origin, who for a long time (since

29. On the *pompa Circensis* and its relations with the triumph, see Piganiol's very personal thesis, *Recherches sur les Jeux romains*, pp. 15-31.

264) had been part of private funerary ceremonies, were not introduced into the great public games until the end of the second century.

Mommsen's statement is generally admitted, that the *ludi* called *magni* and then *Romani* became an annual event and received their standard form in 366, with the creation of the curule aediles, who were qualified as *curatores ludorum solemnium* (Cic. *Leg.* 3.7).³⁰ Probably from the beginning they were what they always remained: the greatest festival in honor of Jupiter O.M. The days for the games were progressively increased to four; they took place from 15 to 18 September, following the *natalis dies* of the temple on the Ides of this month, after the interval of 14 September, which was a *dies ater*. A short while later, when first one day, then several, and finally nine days of theatrical games (*ludi scaenici*) were added before the *natalis dies*, the latter, along with the ceremony of the *epulum Jouis* which marked it, became the evident hinge if not the very center of the festivities. To be sure, this new use of the Circus had no further relation with the old cults belonging to this place, the best known of which is that of Consus; these grouped together other divinities, of whom we know nothing but their names (Seia, Segetia, etc.), but all of whom were connected with the activity of the peasant. In the new games, the spot where the rustic mule races of the Consualia had taken place was laid out as a hippodrome.

Just as the temple of the Ceres-Liber-Libera triad had been the plebeian replica of the temple of the Capitoline triad, so the *ludi Plebei* came to duplicate those of the Capitol, after a delay which cannot be estimated. They became a regular event either in 216 (Liv. 23.30.17), one of the worst years of the war against Hannibal, or a little earlier, on the eve of that war, when the Circus Flaminius was built, which served as their setting just as the Circus Maximus served the prototypical games. There is a systematic homologous agreement in every respect between the two forms of games: their respective *curatores* are the aediles, curule and plebeian; the theatrical games and the circus games are distributed on either side of an *epulum Jouis*, which takes place on the Ides of September (*l. Rom.*) and November (*l. Pleb.*),³¹ the circus games after and the theatrical

30. Disputed by Piganiol, *ibid.*, pp. 75-76.

31. As for the earliest attribution of the *epulum Jouis*, pp. 251 and 277 in Latte seem to contradict each other. Piganiol, p. 84, makes another hypothesis about the relations of the *ludi Romani* and *Plebei*.

games before; in both cases, the *dies ater* which was the fourteenth was set aside for an *aequorum probatio*.

Other creations were to follow quickly: the *ludi Apollinares* (208), *Ceriales* (202), *Megale(n)ses* (191), and *Florales* (173), all inspired by the *ludi Romani*, yet with the undoubted signs of a more exacting Hellenism. The circus games were reduced in them to a single day, while the scenic games were enlarged; probably as a result of this, the cultic day of the god or goddess was no longer framed, but either preceded (*Ap.*, *Cer.*) or followed (*Meg.*, *Flor.*) by the two combined classes of games. The *pompa Circensis* is attested for the *Apollinares* and the *Megalenses*, the Circus Maximus for the *Apollinares*, but for the others there is no evidence. The *curator* of the *Apollinares* was the city praetor, while the curule aediles were in charge of the *Megalenses*, and the plebeian aediles, by virtue of an ancient affinity between the plebs and Ceres, directed the *Ceriales*; we are not informed about the *Florales*.

In their earliest form, the scenic games had also come from Etruria, in the times of distress and of the reorganization of everything which followed the Gallic catastrophe (Liv. 7.2.3). These games were not yet dramatic works, but pantomime, expressive dances with flute accompaniment. Despite Livy's disdain of these humble beginnings, they at least gave Rome and her heirs an essential term: in addition to the *histrio*, the actor, and the *subulo*, the musician, there was the *persona*. This was first the mask, later the role and the character, and later still the "person" of the jurists, the philosophers, the theologians, and the grammarians. Although the word has no etymology, its suffix *-na* suggests an Etruscan origin.³² As Raymond Bloch says:

... curious masked figures which appear on several frescoes discovered at Tarquinia and dating from the end of the sixth century B.C. bear the name *persu*, written alongside one of them. These frescoes are in the tomb of the Augures and in the one called del Pulcinella; both were brought to light a long time ago, but were only lately published in an exhaustive fashion. In 1958, research methods based on the electrical resistance of the ground led to the discovery of a new and highly interesting tomb, on which, along with

32. Skutsch, *ALL* 15: 145-46, has made the *persona-persu* comparison; bibliography in A. Ernout, "Les éléments étrusques du vocabulaire latin," *BSL* 30, 1 (1930): 88, n. 1 (= *Philologica* 1 [1946]: 23).

athletic scenes and extremely lively chariot races, a new *phersu* is portrayed. This new discovery will be the subject of a forthcoming publication.³³ All these *phersu* are masked dancers who are taking part in races or in cruel games which seem to be the distant prototypes of the Roman gladiatorial games. Their name is meaningful; *phersu* is the mask, the masked character, and the Latin word *persona* is certainly derived from the Tuscan term.³⁴

Such was the seed of this powerful idea; what followed must have been copied from the various developments in meaning of the Greek word *πρόσωπον*—which may have been the source of the Etruscan word.

When did the Romans undertake, in the framework of these pantomimes, to create what became their *fabulae Atellanae*? The ancient data are doubtful. The most rudimentary form of spoken or sung theater seems to have been the *ludus talarius* or *talarus*, qualified as *sordidus* by men of refinement, which took its name from the actor's garment that reached to his heels. But it was known in what year Livius Andronicus began to put on real plays. From that time on, in the *ludi Romani* and in the other great games, the theatrical days were taken up conjointly with national productions—*praetextae* or *togatae*—and with the Greek theater, including tragedies by Livius, Ennius, Pacuvius, and Accius, and comedies by Naevius, Plautus, Caecilius, and Terence. But religion did not have very much to do with these literary developments.³⁵

33. Publication occurred in the same year: R. Bartoccini, C. M. Lerici, and M. Moretti, *Tomba delle Olimpiadi* (1959).

34. *Les origines de Rome* (1959), p. 116.

35. On the secular games, above, p. 445. Various aspects of the Roman cults which cannot be treated here have occasioned important works. A few examples: G. Appel, *De Romanorum precationibus*, RRV 7, 2 (1909); E. Fehrle, *Die kultische Keuschheit im Altertum*, RRV 6 (1910); S. P. C. Tromp, *De Romanorum piaculis*, Diss. Amsterdam (1921); R. P. Arbesmann, *Das Fasten bei den Griechen und Römern*, RRV 21, 1 (1929); A. Brelich, "Osservazioni sulle esclusioni rituali," SMSR 22 (1949-50): 1-21 (disputing H. Wagenvoort); K. Meuli, "Altrömischer Maskenbrauch," MH 12 (1955): 206-30. On the religious symbolism of colors: E. Wunderlich, *Die Bedeutung der roten Farbe im Kultus der Griechen und Römer*, RRV 21, 1 (1925); K. Mayer, *Die Bedeutung der roten Farbe im Kultus der Griechen und Römer*, Diss. Freiburg im Breisgau (1927); G. Radke, *Die Bedeutung der weissen und der schwarzen Farbe im Kult und Brauch der Griechen und Römer*, Diss. Berlin (1936); essays 3 ("Albati russati virides") and 4 ("Vexillum caeruleum") of my RIER. (and DL, pp. 120-21, against H. J. Rose).

2

SACERDOTES

The study of Rome's first priests is usually predicated on a postulate which can no longer be maintained, and according to which public religion was only a particular case, a special development of private religion. According to this postulate, a single *paterfamilias* became *rex* over his fellows, and as his power increased, he enhanced his own cults and imposed them on the people as a whole. In an ordinary *domus*, the service of the gods was the duty of the householder and his wife, assisted only by their children: similarly, it is thought, in the *domus regia* of primitive times the *rex*, the *regina*, and their children were responsible for all religious duties; later, as the *rex* found his time more and more taken up by the administration of the state and leadership of the army, he was forced to take on assistants and advisers for religious matters. Chief among these, on the one hand, was the flamen of Jupiter, who was, as tradition says, the sacred counterpart of the *rex*, and who consequently formed a "royal" couple with his wife the *flaminica*, the counterpart of the *regina*. On the other hand there was the *pontifex*, who, besides having some duties in the army, was the registrar of and expert in sacred matters. Actually, the *pontifex* causes some difficulty in this interpretation, not so much by himself as by certain connections he has with the Vestals. Along with L. Deubner, many have seen in the *pontifex* (*maximus*)-*uirgo maxima* pair another projection of the royal couple (thus G. Wissowa); more recently, others have claimed to recognize in the Vestals an institutionalized substitute for the king's daughters, busied with housekeeping and the hearth while their parents went to work in the fields.¹

1. H. J. Rose, "De uirginibus Vestalibus," *Mnem.* n.s. 54 (1926): 440-48, and 56 (1928): 79-80; Latte, p. 108 and n. 4.

These constructions encounter grave improbabilities. With regard to the pontiffs and the Vestals, for example, what a curious menage, in which the principal condition imposed on the wife is the preservation of her virginity! Likewise with regard to the *flamen Dialis*: if it is to be understood that he took the place, in a large part of religious life, of a king who was too busy with secular duties, then it is hard to see why the *regina*, who took no part in secular life, should have been stripped of her religious duties for the benefit of the *flaminica*. Finally, the *flamen Dialis* is only the first of the major flamens: if the other two also duplicate the *rex*—which is scarcely conceivable—why this proliferation?

More than anything else, as is noted in the “Preliminary Remarks,” a consideration of the Indo-European peoples whose traditional word for “king” is equivalent to the Latin *rex* renders this conception untenable. Whatever may have been the origin, in remote prehistory, of the Indo-European **rēg-*, the invaders who occupied Latium did not have to create it:² they brought this function and its agent with them, already fully differentiated and charged with tasks, representations, privileges, and rites which cannot be reduced to the level of private religion: consider, for example, the comparison of the royal sacrifices of the horse in Rome and in India, too close in their motives and their symbolism to be independent.³ The Vedic *rājan* and the Irish *rí* coexist with a numerous body of priests, from whom they choose their particular priest, their *purohita* or their druid; however, he himself does not duplicate the *rājan* or the *rí*, but performs for them and for society services which they, by their very nature, are unfit to undertake. Although legend knows of *rājan* who were at the same time brahmans and *rí* who were druids, these are rare and secondary instances of pluralism, and in no sense evidence of an ancient identity. In Rome, tradition preserved the memory of *reges-augures*, but the augurs were a very special priesthood, and it is unimaginable that a *rex* could at any time have been enveloped in all the paralyzing regulations which characterized the *flamen Dialis*, *quotidie feriat*. The earliest Romans certainly distinguished the king-function from the priest-function. To what extent was the latter a prolongation of an Indo-European tradition?

2. Above, pp. 16-17, 80-81.

3. Above, pp. 224-28.

In the beginning of this book, a feature of Roman religion is indicated which characterizes the temporal and local settings of the cult as well as its agents: the tendency toward parceling out, toward definitive specialization.⁴ In Vedic religion, and probably also in earliest Iran, and certainly among the Celts, the priests were essentially equivalent and interchangeable, fitted to celebrate any ceremony. In Rome, on the other hand, as far back as one goes, each priest, each college or sodality, has its own department; cases of pluralism are rare and regulated, and the replacement of one priest, college, etc., by another is exceptional. If, inversely, the presence of several priests is indicated in a certain number of ceremonies, even here the development of the rites is the concern of a single priest or of one college or one sodality; by contrast, in India every sacrifice requires the combination of several priests holding quite different parts, each articulated with the others. To sum up, for the Vedic Indians the differentiation does not lie in the men, but in the roles which each, indiscriminately, may be called on to fill for the length of a ceremony; while for the Romans it lies in the men, each of whom has his own autonomous specialty. In still other terms, in India the differentiation of men is made temporarily, through and for the formation of officiating teams, while at Rome it is permanent and does not involve the formation of teams.

This discrepancy, to which one may add some others, gives the Roman cult a character which is in certain respects opposed to that of the Vedic cult. But in this very opposition analogies appear which are perhaps more fundamental. In studying the fires of the public cult we have already outlined this situation:⁵ still adapted to migratory pastoral societies, the Vedic rituals did not provide for a permanent sacrificial area; for each ceremony a temporary plot of ground was marked off, lying outside the dwelling places and always of the same type, on which the round site of the fire which established the sacrificer on earth and the square site of the fire which transmitted his offerings to the gods were prepared. Having been sedentary for a long time, the Romans did not have one *ara* or one fire for offerings, but a great number of *arae* within their walls, each reserved for one particular cult or god, and each attached to one square and inaugur-

4. Above, pp. 114-16, 313-15.

5. Above, pp. 312-20.

ated location; in the whole city, and set apart from all the *arae*, there was only one *aedes Vestae*, only one round emplacement for the fire which guaranteed Rome her place on earth. This opposition, at first glance a radical one, is lessened if one considers the whole of the city, within its *pomerium*—the Romans themselves invited this view—as an immense unitary and permanent sacrificial area, within which the quadrangular *templa* and the round *aedes*, with their respective fires, are mystically articulated in the same manner as the two great fires of the Vedic sacrifice in the little temporary area. As for the priests, at least those in the great archaic priesthoods, the opposition is lessened in the same way: the life of Rome may be considered as an immense permanent liturgy, unitary in its distribution throughout the year, in which each priest or college plays a distinctive part, just as each of the various Vedic priests plays his part, in the limited sacrificial area, as a member of the team appropriate for each particular ceremony. Viewed in this way, the characteristics of the principal Roman priests and the functions of the principal priests in the Vedic sacrificial team present two pictures which it is instructive to compare.

The major figures in this team are the *brahmán* on the one hand, and the *adhvaryú*, the *udgātár*, and the *hótar* on the other. The first of these, standing practically alone and peerless, is the most important personage: by his mere presence he insures communication between the visible and the invisible. As his name indicates, he is himself the human embodiment of the neuter *bráhman*, a concept whose meaning is still disputed but which in every case designates something essential in the formulation of the sacred, that is, in the relations of this world with the beyond. While the other priests manipulate the external aspects of the sacred, he is installed inside it and identified with it; consequently, he is simultaneously the presiding officer and the physician of the sacrifice; as long as the rites follow their normal course, he is a passive onlooker, almost always motionless and silent by the side of him for whom the sacrifice is offered; but if anything goes wrong, it is he alone, through his identity with the principle of the rites, who can set it right. It is also he who receives the largest share in the fee for the sacrifice, one-half. His usual Veda, in the canonical classification, is the magical Veda, the *Atharva Veda*.

The *adhvaryú* and his acolytes are the most active priests; they

bustle about, perform the material operations and manipulations, and at the same time mutter the sacrificial words, *yajus*, the voluminous body of which, the *Yajur Veda*, a collection of all the ritual formulas, is the Veda appropriate to this type of priest. The title, *adhvaryú*, is derived from the verb *adhvary-*, *adhvarty-* "to celebrate a sacrifice," itself derived from an ancient noun, *adhvará*, of the "liturgy" interpreted as a mystic "road": *adhvará*, with the archaic *r/n* alternation, is in fact inseparable from Vedic *ádhan-*, Avestan *ađvan-* "road"⁶—to which the old Scandinavian word for ski, *ōndurr*, may be distantly related.

One of the two other types of priest, the *udgātár*, with his associates, forms the chorus of singers, whose book is the *Sāma Veda*; while the other, the *hótar*—the only priest whose title is Indo-Iranian (Avestan *zaotar*)—solemnly recites passages of varying length from the strophes of the *Ṛg Veda*; in the hymns of the *Ṛg Veda* itself, the word *hótar* is chiefly used in connection with the fire god, Agni, who is the *hótar* of the gods.

Rome has no equivalent for these last two types of priest: what would they have had to do? Nor has Rome an equivalent for the learned lyricism of the Vedic hymns, or the melodies which accompany it. In particular cases, to be sure, she does indeed resort to song, but it is only necessary to consider the aesthetic value of the known songs, the *saliare* and the *aruale*, to appreciate the difference. On the contrary, the two great elements of the pontifical college, below the *rex*, are partially clarified by comparison with the Vedic facts, more precisely by the distinction between the *brahmán*⁷ and the *adhvaryú*.

The *flamens* do not constitute a college. Each one is autonomous and solitary, attached to a divinity from whom he derives his name. They are not essentially sacrificing priests, as they are often called:

6. A. Minard, *Trois énigmes sur les Cent Chemins* I (1949): 167 (467 a), pointing to a possible connection with *pontifex*, and 2 (1956): 146 (350 b), cf. E. Benveniste, *Origines de la formation des noms en indo-européen* I (1935): 113; a somewhat different and less probable theory in L. Renou, "Dénominatifs du *Ṛg Veda* en -aryati, -anyati," *BSL* 37, I (1936): 23–24.

7. I now believe that the *flāmen* should not be compared with the *brāhmaṇa*, a member of the priestly class in general, and the first term of the later system of the *varṇa*, but strictly with the particular *brahmán* priest of the Vedic sacrificial team. At most one can combine the rules of the demanding status of a few varieties of *brāhmaṇa*, which seem to be archaic. See my discussion, "A propos du problème *brahmán-flāmen*," *RHR* 138 (1950): 255–58, and 139 (1951): 122–27, some parts of which remain tenable. My early book, *Flāmen-Brahman* (1935), written in full Frazerian fervor (and with an easy Frazerism!) is out of date.

all the priests sacrifice, and even the *Dialis* is not alone in sacrificing to Jupiter. What characterizes them externally is this isolation of each of them, despite their common title, which recalls the solitary position of the *brahmán* in the sacrificial team. The preeminence of the three *maiores* under the single *rex* also recalls the *brahmán*'s place of honor, and is probably founded on the same reason. We do not know very much except about the *Dialis*, but with regard to him things are clear, and the little we do know of the *Martialis* and the *Quirinalis* tends toward the same meaning. The involvement of the *Dialis* with his function is as complete and as intimate as is possible. *Quotidie feriatuus, assiduus sacerdos*, keeping even at night some elements of his insignia, he is not allowed to leave Rome, not even for one night—which was also the rule in primitive times for the *Martialis* and the *Quirinalis*; he is, says Plutarch (*Q.R.* 111), ὥσπερ ἐμφυχον καὶ ἱερὸν ἄγαλμα, like a living sacred statue, enmeshed in a network of immutable personal rules. What is there to say about him, except that he concerns Rome not only through his cultic activity but through what his person represents? As priest of the god of the first function, he serves that god, and at the same time embodies the principle of that function. It is not in his competence as scholar or even as technician of the *sacra* but primarily in his very being that he holds the secret of the mystic powers which constitute that function. He is valuable as much by reason of his body as by his words and his actions: through him Rome has a hold—in the ancient structure formed by the “Jupiter-Mars-Quirinus” triad—on one-third, the highest, of the unseen world. He is the palpable, human end of a string of mystic correlations, the other end of which lies in the sovereignty and the heaven of Jupiter; in the same way the *Martialis* and the *Quirinalis* are probably the human ends of correlations, the invisible ends of which are respectively the warlike strength of Mars and the productive activity of the many gods associated with Quirinus on the level of the “third function.” Through this little human end which she honors and protects tyrannously, Rome maintains a constant contact, both within and outside the cult, with the other end, with the great terminus of each correlation. Many of the regulations, positive and negative, to which the *Dialis* is subjected have no other object, as we have seen,⁸ than to express symbolically

8. Above, pp. 151–53.

and continuously a distinctive and important feature of Jupiter's sovereign function, and thus to keep it safe and available, or to translate an affinity, an organic sensitiveness of the *Dialis* himself for the cosmic zone which is mystically linked to that function, the sky. It is probable that the two other major flamens, each in his own domain, were originally the living pillars of a symbolism of the same type.

This total and intimate involvement of a flamen with his function has one consequence: he lies outside of history. Day by day, month by month, year by year, he performs his regular ceremonies and observes his fixed regulations, but he has no power to actualize, to interpret, or to respond to a new need. The *flamen Dialis*—we must keep coming back to him, since it is he who maintained his status until it could be observed by the historian—this man who is so intimately involved with heaven neither transmits nor interprets the wishes of heaven: that is the business of the augurs. His job is merely to maintain, generally and traditionally, almost passively, as the neuter form of his name suggests (*flamen*, not **flamo*), the connection with the sovereign third of the world. This description contrasts the flamen as much with the *pontifex* as with the *rex*.

The pontifical college, or more precisely the *pontifex maximus*, of whom the others are only an extension, is active and engaged in events of the moment.⁹ He is the trustee of sacred knowledge: the calendar, the formulas of invocation and prayer proper for all circumstances (*uotum, dedicatio, carmina*), the status of the various temples (*leges templorum*),¹⁰ and *piacula*. But he keeps this knowledge up to date, according to the needs and the consultations of the moment, constantly enriching sacred jurisprudence through the *decreta* which he hands down along with his colleagues.¹¹ He is present at the *comitia calata* in which religious acts are performed (*inauguratio* of the *rex sacrorum* and of the *flamines maiores*; the making of wills; the change of *gens* with *detestatio sacrorum*; etc.). He wards off the

9. A. Bouché-Leclercq, *Les pontifes dans l'ancienne Rome* (1871); C. W. Westrup, *On the Antiquarian-Historiographical Activities of the Roman Pontifical College*, *Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, historisk-filologiske Meddelelse*, vol. 16, no. 3 (1929); G. Rohde, *Die Kultsatzen der römischen Pontifices*, *RVV* 25 (1936). The primitive number of the *pontifices* is uncertain; probably five.

10. Example of *lex templi*: that of Jupiter Liber at Furfo (58 B.C.), *CIL*, IX, 3513.

11. Catalano, *DA*, pp. 367–68, does not admit that the pontiffs presided over the *comitia*, but thinks that the presiding officer was the *rex sacrificulus*.

unexpected, and in particular performs for the cults lacking titular heads, and, in the most general way, guides the *sacra patria*, controls the *sacra priuata*, and watches over the *iura deorum Manium*; under the Republic, it is he who “takes,” that is, creates, the major flamens and the Vestals, over whom he has disciplinary powers, while with regard to the latter he is the adviser and sometimes the representative. Many of these duties, which developed progressively, probably stem from the royal heritage, after the establishment of the Republic. But the pontifex would not have received them if they had not been consistent with his nature. His very title, whatever its meaning may be, makes his responsibility, his privilege of action, conspicuous. In Latin—and the word was formed in Latin—*pontifex* has no other meaning than “he who makes the, or a, bridge,” but, despite minor ceremonies at the *pons Sublicius*, such a designation fails to indicate the breadth of the pontiffs’ activities. It has been called (Bonfante) a survival from the times in which the ancestors of the Romans lived in lacustrine cities, but even then was the bridge so important? It is also readily admitted (recently even by Bayet and Latte) that *pons*, in this compound, still has its old Indo-European meaning of “road, way”; but what road or way would be involved here? The road opened on religious occasions for the king’s expeditions (Latte)? This is properly the task of the *fetiales*, another ancient body of priests. *Pontifex* seems rather to be a Latin form, extended to the whole religious life of the state, of the image which causes the active and mobile priest of the Vedic team to take his title too from a figurative designation of the liturgy as a “way” or a “progression.”¹²

It is natural that the *pontifex* should have been the principal heir of the *rex* when one considers the dissimilarity which separates the *rex* from the *flamines*, especially the *Dialis*; it is unlike the dissimilarity of the *flamen* and the *pontifex*, but has the same significance. The *rex* too is active, and by his very nature lives amid present actuality, which he must confront. The way in which he provides for the three

12. Huguette Fugier, *Recherches sur l'expression du sacré dans la langue latine* (1963), has produced very fruitful results from A. Minard's suggestion. G. Herbig, *KZ* 47 (1916): 211-32, made a comparison with the Vedic epithet of several gods, *pathikṛt* “pathmakers” (in *RV* 3.33; 10.17; etc.); but this word is not, like *adhvaryū*, a name of a priest, of a priest as distinguished from the *brahman* in the sacrificial team by features which recall the distinction between the *pontifex* type and the *flamen* type in the general Roman sacerdotal organization.

functions is not that of the three *flamines maiores*.¹³ As we have seen, they are solitary, with no other known interconnection but their annual ride across the city in the same closed vehicle, and the single sacrifice which they offer to Fides. But the solemnity of this occasion proves clearly that it is something out of the ordinary; it is from the fact that they are by nature independent and separate that their exceptional meeting together in the service of Good Faith takes on significance. They do not have a common shrine, and there is no house of the flamens: each of them is the living instrument of mystic correlations between Rome and a third of the forces which constitute the ideology of the world. Who synthesizes these separate forces? The *rex*, by reason of his position. The rule for his situation is to be supreme, a proclaimer of justice and a worshiper of the gods, but also a warrior, as well as the nourisher and protector of the mass of the people. It is not an accident that the legend, on another level and in diverse ways, explicitly focuses these tasks on Romulus. Before showing him alone, complete, and intemperate in his exercise of power, it pairs him with three successive associates: his brother the demigod, like him a trustee, down to the judging of the auspices, of the religious hopes of the foundation; then the Etruscan Lucumo, strictly a specialist in the military art; and finally the man who above all symbolizes wealth, the Sabine Titus Tatius. It also makes him successively a shepherd, then a warrior, and then a legislator. Even more, it associates him personally with the three gods of the triad: the son of Mars, he performs his tasks under the signs and through the protection of Jupiter, who is also the only god whose cults he founds, and at the end, after his death, he "becomes" Quirinus. This logical necessity, however, before becoming the inspiration of legends, was already palpably expressed in the religious utilization and the material arrangement of the Regia, the "house of the king," which the pontiffs were to inherit. In the Forum it reproduced a plan which it had probably already had on the Palatine, and even earlier, because the most ancient ideology of the *rex* is clearly expressed in it. As we have seen,¹⁴ three orders of cults were juxtaposed in the Regia:

13. "Le *rex* et les *flamines maiores*," *Studies in the History of Religions: "The Sacral Kingship," Eighth International Congress of the History of Religions, Rome April 1955* (Suppl. to *Numen*, vol. 4, 1959), pp. 407-17.

14. Above, pp. 172-74.

(1) the sacrifices offered by the *rex*, the *regina*, and the *flaminica Dialis*, and directed either to Jupiter or to Juno and Janus in their capacity as regulators of time (the Calends; January); (2) the military rituals of Mars, in a special *sacrarium*; (3) in another *sacrarium*, rituals of Ops Consiva, the goddess of agricultural plenty and one of the divinities in the circle around Quirinus. Thus the house of the king is the meeting place, and the king is the synthesizing agent of the three fundamental functions, which in contrast the *flamines maiores* isolate and administer analytically. Nevertheless, another tradition makes the first of the *flamines maiores*, the flamen of the celestial *rex* Jupiter, form a particular double structure with the *rex*, which has already been studied on another occasion.¹⁵

Such is the earliest picture, which we are allowed to glimpse by an analysis of the historical, republican state of these various priesthoods, and by the analogy of the Vedic sacerdotal types. From this picture it becomes clear that the *flamines maiores* and the *pontifex* are very probably not creations of Rome under the kings; that the strict status of the former and the freedom of the latter must not be explained by successive creation or by evolutions, but that they correspond to different, pre-Roman definitions and functions which are still apparent in their names; and finally, that it was natural for the greater part of the religious legacy of the royal function to pass to the *pontifex*.

A third sacerdotal type is as it were annexed to the “pontifical college,”¹⁶ probably because it too concerned the *rex* very closely: that of the *uirgines Vestales*, presided over by the *uirgo maxima*.¹⁷ The Vestals constitute an original type, for which ethnography has not discovered many parallels. Their particular connection with the

15. Above, p. 152. Unfortunately too little is known of the services of the *rex sacrorum* to determine the criterion which separates them from those of the *Dialis*. There is epigraphic evidence of a *rex sacrorum* in several Latin cities, Latte, p. 405, n. 4.

16. There is no precise ancient definition of the pontifical college; from Cic. *De domo* 115 and *Har. resp.* 12, we can deduce that it included, besides the *pontifices* (with the *pontifices minores* of that era), the *rex sacrorum* and the *flamines maiores*; however Wiss., pp. 503-4, includes in it the *rex*, the fifteen *flamens*, the *pontiffs*, and the Vestals.

17. G. Gianelli, *Il sacerdozio delle Vestali romane* (1913); T. C. Worsfold, *The History of the Vestal Virgins of Rome*, 2d ed. (1934); a survey of the exact preserved data relating to the Vestals is presented in G. Rohde, *Die Kultsatzungen der römischen Pontifices* (1936), pp. 106-12; but above all see now F. Guizzi, *Aspetti juridici del sacerdozio Romano: Il sacerdozio di Vesta* (1968).

rex arises from the location of the "house" in which they live, the *atrium Vestae*, which is close to the *Regia* and which is sometimes called "royal"; also from the rite, the occasion for which we should like to know, in which once a year they accost the *rex* with the words, "*uigilasne, rex? uigila!*" (Serv. *Aen.* 10.228); from the privilege which they share with the *rex* and the *flamines maiores* of riding to the *sacra publica* in a vehicle, *plostreis* (*Lex Julia Municipalis*, *CIL*, I 206, p. 121, lines 62-65). Finally, their ancient relations with royal power are evidenced by the lictor who precedes them (Plut. *Num.* 10.5). In the times when the *rex* truly reigned, they must have contributed in some mystical way to his safekeeping, reminding us of the Welsh tradition, entirely different in form but with the same meaning, according to which the legendary king Math could live only if he kept his feet in the lap of a virgin girl, except during military expeditions.¹⁸ In republican times, the royal service was of course toned down,¹⁹ and the *uirgines* are primarily *Vestales*, safeguarding the Roman people by maintaining its hearth-fire in the *aedes Vestae*; they nurture the fire day and night, keeping it symbolically apart from the water which kills it and, in ancient times, going far afield, outside of Rome, to fetch the water necessary for the running of the *aedes*.²⁰ To let the fire go out is a serious fault which entails corporal punishment and obliges the priestesses to produce a new flame by means of the fire mill. In addition, the Vestals prepare several sacred "drugs," for the use of all members of the Roman community: the *muries* and the *mola salsa* of the sacrifices²¹ and the *suffimen* of the *Parilia*.²² "Taken" by the *pontifex* at a very early age, between six and ten,²³ they must spend thirty years in their demanding priesthood.²⁴ The basic condition of their service is not merely chastity or purity, but the virginity which is proclaimed in their name, or to which, perhaps, they gave its common name. As happens in many

18. "Meretrices et uirgines dans quelques légendes politiques de Rome et des peuples celtiques," *Ogam* 6 (1954): 8-9.

19. Not without a very lively feeling of the importance held personally by the Vestal for the safekeeping of the state. Cicero exclaims (*Font.* 48), "If the gods scorned her prayers, our safety would be finished!" In a circumstance about which we know nothing, the Vestals climbed in silence to the Capitol with the *pontifex maximus* (Hor. *Carm.* 3.30.8).

20. Above, p. 319.

21. Above, p. 318.

22. Above, pp. 220-24, 373.

23. Gell. 1.12.1.

24. Plut. *Num.* 10.2; Dion. 2.67.2 (contradicting 1.76.3).

so-called primitive societies, virginity, which generally involves mystical powers and peculiar magic, is conceived among them as an intermediate stage between femininity and masculinity; not mythologically, as elsewhere, but juridically, as one might expect at Rome: they are exempted from guardianship (Gaius 1.145; Plut. *Num.* 10.4), bear witness, and dispose of their property by will without restriction (Gell. 1.12.9; 7.7.2, in connection with the legendary Tarratia). In return, the loss of their virginity is an unpardonable offense, for which they are punished, at least in times of crisis, by being buried alive in an underground chamber, in the *campus sceleratus*, while their partner in the crime is cruelly put to death.

How were these various priesthoods—*flamines*, *Vestales*, *pontifices*—joined in the pontifical sphere? This is probably a useless question. The alleged wishes and ambitions of the pontiffs were not involved, since the close ties of these priesthoods around the *rex* were in the nature of all three. As for the way in which the king was relieved of the essential part of his tasks by the *pontifex maximus*, a conception of this is proposed at the beginning of this book.²⁵ It will suffice to add here a few brief remarks.

The pontiffs and the Vestals, but not the fifteen *flamines maiores* and *minores*, saw their number grow in the course of history; the multiplication of the services required of the pontiffs is a good enough reason, with regard to them, for this increase from three to nine (*lex Ogulnia*, 300), then to fifteen (*lex Cornelia*, 82), and finally to sixteen (*lex Julia*, 46). This reason did not exist for the Vestals, and it is not known why their number was increased from four to six; perhaps the initial figure is only an invention of the annalistic tradition; perhaps too they merely participated in the general movement which tended to augment the effective numbers, both in the magistracies and in the priesthoods. In a parallel development, the subordinate personnel of the pontifical college gradually took on more and more importance, relieving the priests of some of their duties: such were the guild of the *calatores pontificum et flaminum* and also the three *scribae pontificis*, who received the title of *pontifices minores* and took part in certain deliberations and actions of the college.

Whereas the *uirgines Vestales* and the *flamen Dialis*—possibly also the other *maiores*—were “taken,” and some other priests (notably

25. Above, pp. 110–12.

the *rex*) were named by the *pontifex maximus*,²⁶ the group of *pontifices*, as well as the majority of the members of the *collegia* and the *sodalitates*, were recruited through co-optation. In primitive times, when the title of *pontifex maximus* or *Vestalis maxima* fell vacant, it was probably the oldest pontiff and the oldest Vestal who were chosen to fill these respective offices, which they held for life.²⁷ In later times, restrictions were imposed on this freedom. In the case of the Vestals, for example, by virtue of a *lex Papia* (Gell. 1.12.11), the grand pontiff had to propose twenty names, and from these the name of the one whom he was obliged to "take" was drawn by public lot; in the cases of the *rex* and the major flamens, the freedom of the *pontifex* was restricted to a choice among three candidates (Liv. 40.42.11, for the *rex*; Tac. Ann. 4.16, for the *Dialis*). The *pontifex maximus* himself, from the end of the third century (the usage is attested from 212, Liv. 25.5.2), was picked from among the other pontiffs by vote of seventeen of the thirty-five tribes, chosen by lot. Finally, in 103, a plebiscite of the tribune C. Domitius Ahenobarbus extended this method of selection to all the members of the great colleges, pontiffs, augurs, decemvirs, and epulones: a "pars populi" chosen by lot had to vote on every vacancy from a list of candidates presented by the college concerned, which was then bound to co-opt the choice of the people (*comitia sacerdotum*). This democratization was an extension of the process which had begun, at the end of the fourth century, with the opening to the plebs of the priesthoods which had been reserved until then for the patricians.

The *augures* and the *decemviri sacris faciundis* will be discussed in connection with the varieties of "signs" which form the material of their specialties. As for the *triumviri epulones*, who likewise increased in number from three to seven, and then to ten, they date from 196 (Liv. 33.42.1); created to relieve the *ueteres pontifices* of a task, and allowed, like them, to wear the *toga praetexta*, they were charged with organizing and supervising the *epulare sacrificium* of the Roman Games and the Plebeian Games. It is probably to the god of these festivals, Jupiter O.M., that they owe their admission to the number of the "great colleges," despite the limited scope of their activity.

26. See texts and discussion in Wiss., p. 510, nn. 2-4; Latte, p. 402.

27. Another opinion in Latte, pp. 109, n. 2, and 196, n. 2.

The sodality of the twenty *fetiales*, which is sometimes called a *collegium*, goes back to the very earliest times.²⁸ It preserved and applied the *ius fetiale*, that is, the procedures which assured Rome, in her dealings with foreign peoples, of the protection of the gods. Judging from the ritual, as Livy has described it, this institution appears to have been the common property of Rome and her Latin neighbors. The two groups of *fetiales*, those of Rome and those of the other state, performed their duties in each other's presence. The old substantive **fēti-*, from which their name is derived, did not mean “clause, stipulation,” as it is often contended, because the concluding of a treaty was not their only function, and the declaration of war, for example, does not involve the idea of “clause.” Like *dhātū* in Vedic, **fēti-* signifies “foundation, basis.”²⁹ In the conduct of internal affairs, the initial contract concluded with the gods and extended by means of the *sacra* and the *signa* was sufficient basis for Rome's actions: here the pontiffs, the augurs, and the other priests operated on firm ground. By contrast, when Rome's actions take her out of her own *ager*, it is necessary to “found” them religiously, to be assured not merely of *ius*, but of that which underlies *ius*, that is, *fās*. This is what the *fetiales* attend to, by means of the **fēti-*. The choice between peace and the breaking of relations, the variable content of treaties, and the management of war depend on the judgment of the magistrates, but the ceremonies, which are always the same, which impart a mystical meaning to these decisions and specifications, and which in every case place the gods on Rome's side, are entrusted to the *fetiales*.

Like the pontiffs for the *ius diuinum* in Rome, the first duty of the *fetiales* as a group is to give the Senate or the consuls the advice on international law which is demanded of them, as for example in the case where Rome, as a defendant, is asked by a foreign nation to pay reparations. For their other operative duties, the sodality details two of its members, only one of whom, called by the still obscure name of *pater patratus*, is active, while the other, called the *uerbenarius*, accompanies him with the sacred herbs, *sagmina*, picked on the Capitol, which qualify them.

²⁸. On the great sodalities, see Wiss., pp. 550–64. On the *ius fetiale*, see now the basic book by P. Catalano, SSR.

²⁹. “Remarques sur le *ius fetiale*,” REL 34 (1956): 93–108; reprinted, with a complement (the Irish legend of Amorgen), in IR, pt. I, chap. 3.

The ceremonies of the *fetiales* and their formulas are known to us for two important occasions: the conclusion of a treaty; and the demand for reparations and declaration of war. In the first, the role of the *pater patratus*, dealing with his foreign opposite number, is to call to witness those present and the gods, to pledge Rome's word before them, and to vow Rome to the wrath of the gods if she fails in her word. This *exsecratio* is accompanied by a scene which is described in two different ways: either the *pater patratus* strikes a pig with the flint which he has brought from the temple of Jupiter Feretrius, saying, "*Si prior defexit publico consilio dolo malo, tum tu illo die, Juppiter, populum Romanum sic ferito ut ego hunc porcum hic hodie feriam, tantoque magis ferito quanto magis potes pollesque*" (Liv. 1.24.8); or else he throws the stone, saying that if he fails in his oath may he fall like it (Pol. 3.25.6-9). When Rome is the offended party and demands reparations, the *fetiales* again go into action. First in Roman territory, close to the boundary, then on the boundary itself, the *pater patratus* calls on Jupiter, the boundary, and the *fas* to witness, affirms under oath the justice of his case, and explains what Rome is complaining of;³⁰ then, with his companion, he begins his march across the virtually hostile territory, repeating this speech three times: to the first person he meets, then when he reaches the gate of the town, and finally in the forum, before the magistrates. If he obtains satisfaction, his foreign counterpart proceeds to make the restitutions demanded; if not, he returns to Rome after having called Jupiter, Juno (according to all the manuscripts),³¹ Quirinus, and the gods of heaven, earth, and the underworld to witness the violation of the *ius*, and having declared war within thirty days. At the end of this period he returns to the boundary, and opens the *iustum piumpue bellum* with a magical action: once again solemnly affirming Rome's right, he hurls onto the enemy soil an iron-tipped spear, or a cornel stake sharpened and hardened in the fire (Liv. 1.32.5-14; Dion. 2.72.6-8). When the diplomatic and military horizon became removed from the limits of the *ager*, the operative role of the *fetiales* wasted away;³² still, for a long time they took part in the concluding of treaties, but it was the *legati populi Romani*, no longer

30. Above, p. 91.

31. But see above, p. 266, n. 26.

32. They continued to be the experts of the Senate: thus Liv. 36.3.7.

a *pater patratus*, who offered the Carthaginian Senate the choice of peace or war. The old ritual of the hurled lance survived, but in a stylized form: a legal fiction declared a plot of ground adjoining the temple of Bellona to be enemy territory, regardless of who the enemy was, and the *pater patratus* in each case performed the first act of violence against this little plot without having to leave Rome.³³

The occasions for action of the other sodalities are more limited, confined to a few days or even to one day of the year. The essential facts have been given above regarding the Salii, the “dancers” of Mars and Quirinus, who go into action on several occasions in March and October, the two seasons in which there is a transition from peace to war or from war to peace.³⁴ Each of these two groups comprises twelve members, and each has its own *magister*, its own district, and its own archives, but all are *in tutela Iouis Martis Quirini*.³⁵ Their accoutrements, if not those of the earliest soldiers, are at least those of very archaic soldiers. They perform intricate dances, in triple time, reproducing (*redamptruare*) the figures performed (*amptruare*) by the leader of the dance (*praesul*), and at the same time follow their choir leader (*uates*) in singing a *carmen*, barely understandable at the end of the Republic, in honor of the gods individually (*uersus Ianii, Iouii, Iononii, Mineruii*, etc.) or collectively (*axamenta*).³⁶ This text ended with the invocation *Mamuri Veturi*, which plausibly refers to the legendary forger of the *ancilia*: in certain Vedic hymns and rituals, the worker-gods, the *Rbhu*, are similarly invoked or served last of all, and the myth explains that they were admitted to the benefit of the sacrifice as payment for their fabrication of miraculous objects.³⁷ Each day of the dance concluded with a banquet, the opulence of which had become proverbial.

The Luperci were responsible only for the savage festival of the

33. Above, p. 391.

34. Above, pp. 275-77.

35. Above, pp. 146-47.

36. There have been several attempts to “restore” the wreck of the *carmen saliare*; e.g., G. Hempl, “The Salian Hymn to Janus,” *TAPhA* 31 (1900): 182-88; L. Bayard, “Le chant des Saliens, essai de restitution,” *Mélanges de Science religieuse des Facultés Catholiques de Lille* 2 (1945): 45-58.

37. See the fourth essay (“Mamurius Veturius”) in *Tarpeia* (1947), p. 218, and “Verumne et Mamurius (Prop. 4.2.57-64),” *Lat.* 10 (1951): 289-93.

Lupercalia, which is briefly described above.³⁸ They too were composed of two groups, but were designated by the names of *gentes*, Fabiani and Quinctiales (the latter name appearing in various forms), that is, "those of the Fabii" and "those of the Quinctii." The passages in Livy (5.46.2; 52.3) which are adduced as evidence do not prove at all that the Fabiani were "a brotherhood of the Quirinal," opposed to and combined with "a brotherhood of the Palatine,"³⁹ which is made highly improbable by the fact that the rites were strictly connected only with the Palatine, where the place called the Lupercal was located. At the end of the Republic, the festival and the priesthood fell into disrepute, and apparently were the occasion of scandals, since Augustus, in order to restore some dignity to both the festival and the priests, forbade any boys to run in the Lupercalia who had not yet shaved off their first beards.

The twelve *Fratres Aruales* were charged with protecting the *arua*, the cultivated fields, against all dangers. In primitive times they did this, like Cato's peasant on his little property, by means of a circumambulation of the *ager*, followed by *suovetaurilia*. In this festival, the Ambarvalia, as in the ritual which Cato describes, Mars was honored not as an "agrarian god" but in his traditional role as a warrior god who put his military prowess or his menacing strength in the service of the *arua*, against visible or invisible foes. Before the end of the Republic, the ritual had been replaced by sacrifices at various points on the former boundary of the *ager*, and the sodality itself had disappeared, leaving its cult to the *pontifices*. Augustus restored it, and the fortunate preservation of long fragments of the *Acta* of the new Aruales makes their rituals among the best known; unhappily, however, these are not the primitive rituals.⁴⁰ Another sodality which Augustus recalled from oblivion, the *sodales Titii*, did

38. Above, pp. 346-50.

39. The *gens Fabia* is said there to have some traditional sacrifices to perform on the Quirinal; but by this kind of deduction, one would be able to "prove" that the Quinctiales were a "Vatican brotherhood": the *prata Quinctia*, where one of the most famous Quinctii, Cincinnatus, was made dictator when plowing (Liv. 3. 26. 8; Plin. *N.H.* 18. 20; etc.), were located on that hill. Was it not natural that, as the Palatine Rome progressively occupied the colles, the old *gentes* as well as the Palatine gods, took possession of some places on them (above pp. 76-78)?

40. G. Henzen, *Acta fratrum Arualium quae supersunt* (1874); G. Wissowa, "Zum Ritual der Arvalbrüder," *Hermes* 52 (1917): 321-47; M. Nacimovich, *Carmen Aruale*, 2 vols. (1933-34); E. Norden, *Aus römischen Priesterbüchern* (1939), pp. 109-268. Ae. Pasoli, *Acta fratrum Arualium* (1950) (text, with the most recently discovered fragments, and commentary).

not have this good fortune; we cannot even guess at its activity during the republican era, though a few clues suggest that it should be classed in the “third function.”⁴¹

This just about exhausts the survey of the priesthoods of royal and republican Rome. Despite the limited changes which occurred, chiefly in the manner of recruitment, it confirms the resolutely conservative character of Roman religion. A few *flamens* and *sodalities* practically disappeared in the course of the last century, but the surviving priests, even the *pontifices* in the strict sense of the word, the group which was most dynamic and most exposed to innovations, continued to perform basically the same rituals and ceremonies that they had performed from time immemorial.⁴²

41. *JMQ* 4: 140-45.

42. On the *camilli* and *camillae*, young boys and girls serving as auxiliaries in the cult, Latte, pp. 407-8; on other auxiliaries, pp. 408-10; on the *aeditui* attached to the temples, pp. 410-11.

3

SIGNA AND PORTENTA

All religions recognize signs, whether miraculous or natural, sent to men either to reveal the feelings of the gods to them, or to show them how to behave, or to guide their steps, or to resolve their problems. Few peoples, however, have carried the science of these signs to the same lengths as the Romans. The *auguria* counterbalance the *sacra*, and yet they are far from being the gods' only means of expression. Side by side with the pontifical college, yet independent of it, just as old and just as important, is the augural college. And yet, at the end of the regal period the Romans began to consult other interpreters of the signs, and they never ceased to do so.

In the "Preliminary Remarks" and in the body of this book, the *augurs*¹ have been encountered several times. The reading of the inscription on the Lapis Niger indicates the great stability of their discipline: they appear there—whether already as *augures* acting for the *rex*, or still as a single *rex-augur*—with their *calator*, protected by a strange rule which will survive until a later era, engaged in an operation and following a route which Cicero's contemporaries will still be practicing, and for an end result that is apparently described by ancient adjectives which will still retain their technical meanings.²

1. We now have at our disposal P. Catalano's great and very well-informed book, *Contributi allo studio del diritto augurale*, vol. 1 (= DA) (1960); the first part is devoted, with an original solution, to the examination of the interpretations proposed for the distinction between the *augurium* and the *auspicium*. The principal works, besides A. Bouché-Lercq's monumental book, *Histoire de la divination dans l'antiquité*, vol. 4 (1882), include numerous studies by P. Regell between 1878 and 1893 and the articles in DA, RL, RE; F. David, *Le droit augural et la divination officielle des Romains* (1895); the series of studies by I. M. J. Valetton in *Mnem.* from vol. 17 (1889) to vol. 26 (1898); E. Flinck, *Auguralia und Verwandtes*, *Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae*, Ser. B, vol. 11, no. 10 (1921); U. Coli, *Regnum* (1951), pp. 77-98; and A. S. Pease's commentary to his edition of the *De divinatione* (1920-23).

2. Above, pp. 84-88 and n., p. 87, n. 7.

Other indices provide the same information. The *augures publici*, says Varro (L.L. 5.33), distinguish five kinds of fields: *ager Romanus*, *ager Gabinus*, *ager peregrinus*, *ager hosticus*, and *ager incertus*. The spotlighting of the single territory of Gabii—itsself *peregrinus*, says the commentary, but “set apart,” *discretus*, because it has *auspicia singularia*—takes us back to an extremely early era, not just in history, but in the prehistory of Latium.³ This extraordinary stability is unfortunately counterbalanced by the effects of another feature of the *ius augurale*, the secrecy which always cloaks it. To be sure, the antiquarians knew and described important fragments, but the little we can read does not allow us to see the whole body of doctrines and practices. Some of the ceremonies which it would be most useful to know about are enigmas. Even the one that I have suggested gave rise to the inscription on the Lapis Niger (Varr. L.L. 5.47) is unidentified. Wissowa says that it may be the obscure *augurium salutis*, while others see in it the periodic reauguration of all the *templa*, which is perhaps mentioned by a single text.⁴ What are the *augurium canarium* and the *uernisera auguria* mentioned in the glosses of Festus (p. 386 L²) or of his abridger (p. 467 L²)? The latter—the last gloss in this valuable catalog—are only a name. Of the former we know only that it involved the sacrifice of red dogs and that it took place, on a day set by the pontiffs, before the grains of wheat came out of their husks, but not before they had been formed there (Plin. N.H. 18.14).⁵ A terminological uncertainty adds confusion to obscurity: how is *auspicium* essentially different from *augurium*? Ingenious theories have tried to explain the difference in various ways, but they are subject to so many exceptions that none is convincing. Not to mention the evolutionist interpretations (the magical *augurium* yielding to the divinatory *auspicium*: De Francisci), are the *auspicia* properly the business of the magistrates, and the *auguria* the business of the augurs (most recently, Coli)? Only one part of the facts conforms to this view. The same is true of the multiple differential definitions proposed by the ancients. The best writers, including Cicero, use the two terms equivalently too often to allow one to think that the language, even the technical language, distinguished them absolutely.

3. Catalano, SSR, pp. 273–88.

4. Not admitted by Catalano, DA, p. 291, n. 176.

5. L. Delatte, *Recherches sur quelques fêtes mobiles du Calendrier romain*, pt. 4 *Augurium canarium* (1937), pp. 27–36 (reprinted from AC); Catalano, DA, pp. 346–51.

Perhaps this problem, which has been called central, is still a false one. The etymology of the two words does not predetermine them to form a pair. *Auspicious*, "the observation (*specere*) of the birds (*aves*)"—a technique which the Umbrian ritual of Iguvium also employs (*auif aseria*)—concerns only the method of the operation, not its intention or its result; *augurium*, the act of *augurare*, "the determination, the affirmation of the presence of the **auges*-" (and probably at first, and perhaps still in some archaic rituals, the conferring of the **auges*),⁶ on the other hand, is concerned only with the intention and the result of the operation, not with its methods. Thus, etymologically, it is fair to say that in the performance of his office, which is *agere augurium*, the augur *aves specit* (Varr. *L.L.* 6.82). It is conceivable that such words, in the course of the centuries, were organized into multiple, loosely interpreted counterbalancing pairs, without ever becoming completely opposed in meaning.

A great deal of information that we have regarding the augural art and its utilization concerns its relations with the action of the magistrates and with politics. In the final centuries of the Republic, there is scarcely anything else: this material belongs to the history of the institutions rather than to that of religion. As for the rest, since it is impossible to present a coherent picture of it, we shall confine ourselves to a few points on which we have more detailed information.

Whatever its origins and its surviving features may have been, the art of the augur is essentially one of consultation and explanation; it is not concerned with predictions. The priest asks Jupiter—for he is the master of the signs and the augurs are his interpreters (Cic. *Leg.* 2.20)—if it is *fas* for such and such a person to receive a sacred function, or for such and such a place to be a place of worship; and he puts this question in the following way: *si fas est . . .* "send me such and such a sign." Even the *augurium salutis*, originally an operative ceremony, has been reduced to this common form, which gave an almost absurd result: the god was no longer solicited directly to give *salus* to the people; one questioned him: "Is it *fas* to ask for *salus*?" The procedure by which the augur, with his *lituus*, the crooked staff which is his instrument, establishes communication

6. Above, p. 119. Catalano, *DA*, pp. 103, 347, rejects this interpretation (offered by Delatte and myself), but does not convince me.

with Jupiter and somehow chooses the vocabulary of his conversation with him, has been described at some length by Livy in connection with the inauguration of the legendary Numa (1.18.5-10):

And so they [*Patres*] unanimously voted to offer the sovereignty to Numa Pompilius. Being summoned to Rome he commanded that, just as Romulus had obeyed the augural omens in building his city and assuming regal power, so too in his own case the gods should be consulted. Accordingly an augur (who thereafter, as a mark of honour, was made a priest of the state in permanent charge of that function) conducted him to the citadel and caused him to sit down on a stone, facing the south. The augur seated himself on Numa's left, having his head covered, and holding in his right hand the crooked staff without a knot which they call a *lituus*. Then, looking out over the City and the country beyond, he prayed to the gods, and marked off the heavens by a line from east to west, designating as “right” [*dextrae partes*] the regions to the south, as “left” [*laevae partes*] those to the north, and fixing in his mind a landmark opposite to him and as far away as the eye could reach; next shifting the crook to his left hand and, laying his right hand on Numa's head, he uttered the following prayer: “Father Jupiter, if it is Heaven's will [*fas*; i.e., if there is a mystical basis] that this man Numa Pompilius, whose head I am touching, be king in Rome, do thou exhibit to us unmistakable signs [*uti tu signa nobis certa adclarassis*] within those limits which I have set.” He then specified the auspices which he desired should be sent, and upon their appearance Numa was declared king, and so descended from the augural station [*templum*].

In orienting the augur toward the east, on Numa's left, the historian gives only half of the lexicon of the celestial regions. Varro (*L.L.* 7.7) completes it, with an orientation toward the south (that of Numa himself in Livy's account): the *pars sinistra* is to the east, the *pars dextra* to the west, the *pars antica* to the south, and the *pars postica* to the north. The declaration of the requested signs is the *legum dictio* (Serv. *Aen.* 3.89); it is not known how much latitude was left to the augurs for determining them according to their position in relation to the four *regiones*.

Livy, who sees in Numa's inauguration the prototype of all inaugurations of persons, locates it anachronistically in the *auguraculum* which the augurs later had on the Capitol. Was this place itself a *templum*? Very likely, because, theoretically, the solicitation and observation of signs (*auspicia impetratiua*) could only be performed in an area with “marked-out” boundaries, a *templum* (Varr. *L.L.* 7.8).

Quadrangular, with or without visibly marked outlines, and with a single entrance, this area had to be somehow exorcised and freed (*effari, liberare*), by appropriate formulas, of all the hostile or impure powers which might dwell in it (Cic. *Leg.* 2.21; cf. Serv. II *Aen.* 4.200).⁷

The *auspicia impetratiua* are observed either by the augurs or, under certain conditions and with technical differences, by the magistrates, who perform the *spectio*, while the augurs then normally retain the job of validating them (*nuntiatio*) or of declaring them invalid (*uitiosa*). The science of interpreting signs was in fact extremely complex, and we know only a few of its great categories and a few details. With regard to the birds, for example, only certain well-determined species, the *aves augurales*, gave valid signs (Cic. *Diu.* 2.76), the meaning of which varied according to the species of bird. A distinction was made between the *alites* and the *oscines* (e.g., the raven, the crow, the screech owl, and the magpie), according to whether the signs were sought in the flight or in the call (Fest. p. 308 L²; Varr. *L.L.* 6.76), with the particular case, which might be either embarrassing or convenient, of birds which gave favorable signs as *alites* and unfavorable ones as *oscines* (Serv. *Aen.* 4.462). For the *alites*, factors taken into account besides the region of the sky included the height and manner of flight, the behavior of the bird, and the place where it perched; for the *oscines*, the tone of the bird's call and the direction from which the sound came. There was a hierarchy (*gradus*) of signs: if, after the osprey (*?parra*) or the woodpecker had given theirs, the eagle gave one of contrary meaning, it was the eagle's sign which prevailed (Serv. *Aen.* 2.374). Moreover, there were strict conditions governing the validity of the observation. Certain noises which broke the required *silentium*, such as the squeaking of a mouse, the falling of an object, or a chair's creaking, nullified the entire operation, and as we have seen, the *iuges auspicium*, a paralyzing sign, was enough to cancel it in advance, by intercepting the augur on his way to performing his function.⁸

7. E. Norden, *Aus altrömischen Priesterbüchern* (1939), pp. 3-106 ("Die Spruchformel des Augurn auf der Burg"); K. Latte, "Augur und Templum in der Varronischen Auguralformel," *Philol.* 97 (1948): 143-59. According to Latte, the formula dates from the time when Italy was occupied by the Indo-Europeans and was originally intended to free that portion of the earth where they wished to settle (*tescum*) from every evil power; after the settlement, the formula was appropriated just as it was for the determination of the *templum*. A useless hypothesis; the text is Varr. *L.L.* 7.8-10.

8. Above, p. 86.

The signs of the birds were not the only ones, either of the *impe-tratiua* or of the *oblatiua*, that is, those which were not solicited but which occurred by themselves. Festus distinguishes five classes of the latter, which varied widely in age (Paul. p. 367 L²): *ex caelo* (i.e., thunder and lightning), *ex auibus*, *ex tripudiis* (i.e., the behavior of the sacred chickens), *ex quadrupedibus* (dog, horse, wolf, fox), and *ex diris* (i.e., the threatening presages). The signs which supplanted the old ones taken from the flight and song of the birds, during the last centuries of the Republic, were the signs *ex caelo* and *ex tripudiis*.

The simple and expeditious use of the sacred chickens was for a long time reserved for generals in the field. If the chickens brought for this purpose ate greedily, letting the food drop from their beaks, the presage was favorable (Cic. *Diu.* 2.72). It can be imagined how easy it was to obtain such a result: all one had to do was to starve the fowls for a while and then to give them a sticky food (*ibid.* 73). In the general corruption of religious customs, the magistrates did not fail to provide themselves with such a docile instrument of information, and the *pullarius* figures among the personnel enumerated by Cicero (*Leg. agr.* 2.32), along with the *scriba*, the *lictor*, and the *praeco*.

Cicero is severe regarding the signs *ex tripudiis*, and he is no less so for the signs *ex caelo*: both groups are mere parodies of auspices, *simulacra sunt auspiciorum, auspicia nullo modo*. In fact, in the first century Jupiter's thunderbolt was a valuable weapon in the hands of anyone who wished to prevent or suspend the *comitia* (*ibid.* 2.74): all that was necessary was to say that one had heard the thunder. A further advance on this track came about when the magistrate no longer had to observe the sky personally or to pretend to have done so, but turned over this duty to the *pullarius*—or rather, commanded the *pullarius* to say that he had seen the thunderbolt (*ibid.*: *nunc imperant pullario*; cf. Dion. 2.6.2). This debasement of the practice as well as the growing vogue for consulting haruspices, ultimately destroyed the augural art, which the Augustan restoration found in a deplorable condition. Cicero declares that his fellow augurs have forgotten their science (*Diu.* 1.25). If elsewhere he blames only the *ueltustas* of the material and the *negligentia nobilitatis* (*Leg.* 2.33; *Nat. d.* 2.9), the principal treatise in which he discusses this evil shows that he is fully aware of its true causes. The way had certainly been

prepared for these excesses by the precautions and legal ruses which the Romans and the augurs themselves had already permitted in more innocent times as safeguards against an obsession with signs, against the "psychosis of the sign."⁹ But in the intervening period the Greek experiment had done its work: the prestigious religion of the conquered people offered its oracles and imposed its myths, but contributed nothing which could rejuvenate or reinvigorate the casuistry of the *interpretes Jouis O.M.*

Whether solicited or occurring naturally, the *auspicia* whereby Jupiter expresses himself do not contradict the laws of nature, nor do the words of men, expediently understood, which become *omina*.¹⁰ Different in all respects are the prodigies, extraordinary and often monstrous phenomena.¹¹ They indicate only the wrath of the gods, or of a god, who must be identified and appeased. In the ancient era, they do not predict or foreshadow the future, any more than did the *auspicia*, but they do not even clarify the present: all they do is raise formidable problems in unexpected ways. All peoples are more or less aware of such surprises; but here too the Romans are unusual, not so much because of the feelings with which they regard the prodigies as because of the place which these events occupy in their lives, and especially because of the unforeseen consequences which this attention produced in the development of religion, even beyond its proper object. The great variety of names given to the prodigy is remarkable: in addition to the general word *prodigium*, we find

9. Above, pp. 120-21.

10. E. Benveniste, *Hittite et indo-européen* (1962), pp. 10-11, has given the most likely etymology of *ōmen*: the root is that of Hittite *hā-* "to accept as the truth."

11. In this account I follow in general the presentation of R. Bloch, *Les prodiges* (1963), where the basic bibliography will be found. The list of recorded prodigies is in F. Luterbacher, *Der Prodigien Glaube und Prodigienstil der Römer*, Beilage zum Jahresbericht Gymnasium Burgdorf (1880), and in L. Wülker, *Die geschichtliche Entwicklung des Prodigienwesens bei den Römern*, Diss. Leipzig (1903); cf. E. de Saint-Denis, "Les énumérations de prodiges dans l'oeuvre de Tite-Live," *RPh.* 16 (1942): 126-42. F. Brunell Krauss has identified many natural phenomena which might have been regarded as supernatural in *An Interpretation of the Omens, Portents, and Prodigies Recorded by Livy, Tacitus, and Suetonius*, Publications of the University of Pennsylvania (1931). On the political utilization of the prodigies, see R. Guenther, cited above, p. 528, n. 1. An interesting category of signs has been studied by J. Bayet, "Présages figuratifs déterminants dans l'antiquité gréco-latine," *Annales de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire slaves de l'université de Bruxelles* 4 (*Hommages à F. Cumont*, 1) (1936): 27-51. See also Latte, pp. 157-61 and notes (haruspication, *Etrusca Disciplina*, Sibylline Books), and, the important chapter on divination in P. Boyancé, *La religion de Virgile* (1963), pp. 83-113.

ostentum and *portentum*, *monstrum*, and *miraculum*. *Ostentum* and *portentum* seem to be applied by preference to phenomena of inanimate nature, just the opposite of *monstrum*; *miraculum*, the least technical word in the group, indicates the prodigy as an occasion for astonishment.

In this matter Rome certainly owes a great deal to Etruria. No matter how ill-informed we are, lacking native texts, about the beliefs of this people, its somber and anxious character is unmistakable. Their gods were dreadful powers. But it is difficult, on the basis of late or deformed legends, to reconstruct or even to date the influences. Were the Etruscan influences the only ones? Did not the Greeks make their contribution at an early date? As always, the historians are divided on this point into conservatives and skeptics, with each group having solid arguments. They are in agreement on only one small but important point: the tradition, of which we have read above, which places the “acquisition” of the Sibylline Books in the time of the second Tarquin corresponds roughly to an authentic fact; the first conjuring books connected with the prodigies were introduced to Rome during her Etruscan period.¹²

But what were these “Sibylline Books,” in which for centuries Rome claims to have read the formulas for her protection against the prodigies? Many authors accept, while several others reject, the idea that in the beginning these collections were Greek, that they came from Cumae, and that they were connected with a “Sibyl,” or even with Apollo. The former group remind us that the ornamentation of the temple of Ceres-Liber-Libera, allegedly the first consequence of a consultation of the Books, was entrusted to Greek artists: is this not a proof that by then the Greeks were freely admitted to the City? The latter note that the very idea of oracular books is not Greek, that there never was an oracle with a priestess, nor a Sibyl, at Cumae, despite what Virgil says about her, and that similar books are known in Etruria: *Libri rituales*, *acherontici*, *ostentarii*; even if we are obliged to think that their constitution as a corpus took place somewhat later than the Romans believed, they were preceded in very ancient times by a firm oral tradition, and probably by fragmentary redactions, and the “revelations” of the little man

12. Above, pp. 441-42 and below, pp. 633-37.

Tages and of the nymph Begoe were based on an active, living science. The first *Libri* must have been indebted to these Etruscan collections, or must rather have combined indiscriminately Latin prescriptions, formulas, and superstitions with similar foreign, chiefly Etruscan, writings. Not until the third century were they overrun, like so many things, by Greek elements, to the extent that their character was changed and they merited their classical name of *Sibyllini*. The first definite manifestation of this change would be the order issued in 293 to introduce the god Aesculapius into Rome.

The discussion still goes on and will continue to do so. It is possible to discourse endlessly about the probabilities and improbabilities in the account given by Dionysius of Halicarnassus of the "first" consultation, in 496. Personally, though I cannot offer a decisive argument, I find this account highly suspicious. It is all the more suspicious in that the account of the second consultation in 461 (Dion. 10.2; Liv. 3.10.5-7) betrays itself as an anachronism through its very precision: how could the memory of so many prodigies have been preserved? Are not the political overtones and the hints of fraud those of the last centuries of the Republic? Moreover, the response of the guardians of the Books is of an aberrant type: the recommendations which they offer for the *procuratio* of the prodigies (again it is only Dionysius who speaks of this) are matched with actual prophecies and counsels. Here is Livy's version, the less wordy one:

In the following year the Terentilian law [a proposal of the tribune Terentilius Harsa, tending to limit the power of the consuls] was brought up again by the entire college and menaced the new consuls, to wit, Publius Volumnius and Servius Sulpicius. This year the heavens were seen to blaze, and the earth was shaken with a prodigious quake. That a cow had spoken—a thing which had found no credence the year before—was now believed. Among other portents there was even a rain of flesh, which is said to have been intercepted by vast numbers of birds flying round in the midst of it; what fell to the ground lay scattered about for several days, but without making any stench. The two commissioners for sacred rites consulted the Sibylline Books, where it was predicted that there was danger to come from a concourse of foreigners, lest they attack the highest places of the City, and blood be shed; amongst other things was a warning to avoid factions. The tribunes charged them with trying to hinder their law, and a violent struggle was impending; . . .

There are indeed many reasons for astonishment in this text, but the point at which astonishment dictates rejection is not the same for all the critics.

In any case, the list of the prodigies of 461 is a good forerunner of those which fill Livy's third decade and which deserve more credit for the reason that the pontiffs, since the beginning of the third century, recorded in writing the principal events of the year. Collections of these writings were made, some of which still survive as splendid monuments to human credulity. The following, chosen from among many, is one of the abstracts made by Julius Obsequens (44), for the year 102, in which Italy was saved from the Teutones and the Cimbri, C. Mario, Q. Lutatius Coss.:

A *sacrificium nouendiale* was performed because there had been a shower of stones among the Etruscans. The city was purified at the recommendation of the haruspices, with the ashes of the victims being scattered in the sea by the decemvirs, and for nine days the magistrates, at the head of the solemn procession, went from temple to temple to make *supplicationes*. The spears of Mars shook of their own accord in the Regia. There was a rain of blood in the vicinity of the river Anio. In the Forum boarium a swarm of bees lighted on a chapel. In Gaul, in the camp, a light shone during the night. At Aricia a young boy of good family was enveloped in flames without being burned. The temple of Jupiter, which was closed, was struck by lightning. The haruspex Aemilius Potensis, who had been the first to suggest the expiation of this prodigy, received a reward; the others had kept it secret, because it necessarily entailed their death and that of their children. The pirates were defeated in Sicily by the Romans. The Teutones were massacred by Marius. The *ancilia* shook of their own accord, with a great clashing. A slave of Servilius Caepio castrated himself in honor of the Idaean Mother and was deported overseas and forbidden ever to return to Rome. The city was purified, a goat with burning horns was let through the city and out of the Porta Naevia, and then released. Shower of mud on the Aventine. Defeat of the Lusitanians. Pacification of Farther Spain. Destruction of the Cimbri.

The balance sheet is beautiful in its dryness. Drowned in this flood of miraculous happenings, the victories at Aquae Sextiae and Vercellae only stand out in greater relief.

Here at the end of the second century it is the haruspices who are asked for the formula of *procuratio* for prodigies occurring not merely in Etruria but on the Capitol. In the preceding centuries they had not

been so honored. According to the usual procedure, when a prodigy was reported by the witnesses (*nuntiare*), and if it did not seem possible to wait for the annual statement by the new consuls, the incumbent consuls, after evaluating it (*prodigii loco habere*), referred it to the Senate (*referre ad senatum*), which deliberated on it. If the Senate did not accept the prodigy, the state disclaimed it and abandoned it to *procuratio priuata*. If they did accept it (*susplicere*), they consulted the competent authorities, and on their recommendation ordered the *procuratio* advised. In a few rare cases, and only between 203 and 176, the Senate applied to the pontiffs, who then issued a *decretum*. Thus, in the sixteenth year of the war with Hannibal, at the moment when Scipio was winning his first victories in Africa and when Rome had twenty legions and one hundred and sixty warships in active service, a whole series of prodigies produced *nouas religiones* in the minds of the Romans: gold had been eaten on the Capitol by crows, and at Antium by rats; Capua had been overrun by grasshoppers; at Reate a colt had been born with five legs; at Anagnia and Frusino strange meteors had danced in the sky; at Arpinum a great abyss had opened up in the plain. Even more serious, one of the two consuls had found a liver without a head in the first victim which he had sacrificed. The *procuratio* was performed with *hostiae maiores*, the pontiffs having designated the divinities to whom they should be offered (Liv. 30.2.10-13). Most frequently, however, it was the Sibylline Books which were consulted, or rather the *decemuiri sacris faciundis* who were in charge of them. Here is what this college was.

According to the legend, when Tarquin received the Books he deposited them in the temple of Jupiter and named a two-man committee, *duumuiri sacrorum* or *sacris faciundis*, charged with consulting them (*adire*) on the express order and exclusively on behalf of the state. Certain critics think that these were not originally permanent *duumuiri* but rather a kind of commission specially created every time a consultation seemed necessary. It was only in 367, as a consequence of increasing pressure by the plebeians, that one of the Licinian laws is said to have created the permanent college of the *decemuiri*, five patricians and five plebeians, co-opted and presided over by a *magister*. The plebs, which was inclined to make innovations,

thus found itself installed at the very first attempt within the organization most suited to make them. In Sulla's time the Ten became Fifteen (*quindecimviri s.f.*), like the pontiffs and the augurs in the same period. As for the Books, whatever one thinks of their origins and however one pictures these collections, they were certainly Grecized at the moment when the Second Punic War expanded their use. In 213 they were augmented by the *carmina Marciana*, which were retired from circulation by the state and reserved for its own use. Burned in Sulla's time along with the Capitol, reconstructed or reforged by commissions sent to every place in the world where there were Sibyls, and particularly to Erythrae, expurgated under Augustus and transferred from Jupiter to Apollo, from the Capitol to the Palatine, revised once more under Tiberius, they were burned at the beginning of the fifth century of the Christian era by Stilicho. The college, which had been honored by the emperors, then disappeared.

In principle, the consultation of the Books bore on two points, and on them alone: of what does the required *procuratio* consist? To which gods should the rites—sacrifices, prayers, etc.—which it involves be addressed? But this double inquiry might lead one far afield, even beyond the city and its tradition. It is not possible to exaggerate the part played by this college in the religious enrichment of Rome. From 293 on, in any case, it was through it that the gods and the rituals of Greece made their official entry, and in 204, with the Magna Mater, those of the East. The decemvirs placed initiative, fantasy, and art by the side of, if not within, the old religion. The events of the Second Punic War show them on the point of rivaling the pontiffs in their own domain, and ordering ceremonies in honor of the national gods. But it does not appear that there was ever any conflict between the two great colleges, between the function of preservation and that of expansion, any more than between the decemvirs and the state; plebeians or patricians, they oriented their religious activity, notably in the summoning of Venus Erycina and of the Magna Mater, along the lines of official policy and diplomacy, whose valuable auxiliaries they were. The competence of the pontiffs was always confined to Italy, but for the Ten Men the whole world and its storehouse of cults was available, and they made wise use of it.

The historical career of the *haruspices* is entirely different.¹³ Their discipline is that of inspecting entrails, but this inspection is a complex and learned one, quite different from the *probatio* performed after the execution of the victim by the Roman sacrificers. The latter merely verified that the *exta* were normal and then proclaimed the *litatio* or its opposite; the *haruspices* found in the entrails a wealth of information which, oriented by the form, the place, the time, and the circumstances of the prodigy on which they were consulted, allowed detailed counsels to be given.¹⁴ This doctrine was wholly Etruscan; perhaps Etruscan too was the beginning of their name, which is parallel to *au(i)-spex*. The investigators of entrails were certainly introduced to Rome during the hegemony of the "Tarquins." They never lost the prestige which is attached to the exact sciences, even the false ones, but they were suspect during the long confrontation between the Roman Republic and the Etruscan cities: not one consultation is mentioned throughout the fifth century, and during the war with Veii they play an active role, appropriately enough, in the service of their own country, the enemy. Even afterward, Rome seldom had recourse to their services: only three times, according to the annalistic tradition, until the Second Punic War, and on one of these occasions—unfortunately not dated—she had reason for dissatisfaction with them. Aulus Gellius tells us (4.5), following the *Annals of the Pontiffs*, that the statue of Horatius Cocles, standing on the Comitium, was struck by lightning; *haruspices* were summoned from Etruria, but they, *inimico atque hostili in populum Romanum animo*, advised a *procuratio* contrary to the one which was necessary: they said the statue should be moved to a less elevated place which was so situated that the surrounding houses would cut off all the rays of the sun. Denounced shortly afterward, they confessed and were put to death, and then, when the *ueræ rationes* had been discovered—we do not know by whom—the statue

13. On Etruscan haruspication, see the bibliography in the notes of the appendix, below, pp. 617–27. One will find there the essential elements of what is known concerning the various parts of the *disciplinae Etruscae*, following the division by Cicero, *Diu.* 1.72: *libri fulgurales* (pp. 637–49), *libri haruspici* (pp. 649–60), *libri rituales* (pp. 660–72). Cf. J. G. Préaux, "Un texte méconnu sur Tagès," *Lat.* 21 (1962): 379–83 (haruspicy, extispicy).

14. In the historical era, the distinction was attenuated: R. Schilling, "A propos des *exta*: L'extispicine étrusque et la *litatio* romaine," *Coll. Lat.* 58 (*Hommages à A. Grenier*) (1962): 1371–78; cf. also (Fest.), Paul. p. 274 L²: *muta exta appellabant ex quibus nil diuinationis animaduertebant*.

was placed in a more elevated place than the Comitium, on the *area Volcani*. Meanwhile, in Etruria itself, there must have been a quick and profound change of attitude, since Hannibal, when marching through the region and camping there with his Gauls, was unable to win it over to revolt against Rome. Also, starting with this period we see an increase in consultations of the haruspices concurrently with those of the Sibylline Books, and later on there is a still greater increase. On many occasions, by offering fees, the state brought haruspices from Etruria, many of whom remained in Rome. They made a living from their trade, explaining prodigies to the *priuati*, and inspecting the bellies of their victims, combining with the art of entrails the art of the sky, as it was revealed by the *Libri fulgurales* of their country—in short, becoming true “soothsayers.”

Of foreign nationality but serving an exclusively Roman clientele, both official and private, they were led to develop their science and to adapt it to civil, political, and religious questions which it had not anticipated. Thus there was formed an Etrusco-Roman science of haruspication, which is called Etruscan for short. Care must be taken not to refer all the rules and all the responses back to the old discipline: what survived were the method, the principles, and the models, but the details could not help being changed. Moreover, with the haruspices using their knowledge for commercial profit as they did, could their “professional conscience” be relied on? The Romans were aware of this risk: the haruspex might lie or remain silent, according to his personal interests. While they were used, they were not fully trusted. The Senate called on several of them, separately, using some to check the others, and rewarding the zeal of the best with subsidies: the passage from Julius Obsequens quoted above contains a good example of this justified mistrust. A chapter of Plutarch’s *Life of Sulla* gives a lively and detailed picture of these consultations in which, even when they were sincere, the learned men, the haruspices become soothsayers, did not forget their own advantage and self-advertisement. At the moment when Marius is about to seize power, this “fatal uprising” is preceded by a number of prodigies: fire breaks out among the staves of the ensigns and is brought under control only with great difficulty; three ravens bring their young into the city and after devouring them in view of the public, carry the remains back to the nest; mice gnaw at some

consecrated gold in a temple, and one of them, caught in a trap, gives birth in the trap itself to five young and eats up three of them; but the most striking phenomenon of all is the shrill and dismal sound of a trumpet ringing out from a cloudless sky. Plutarch continues (*Syll.* 7.7-11):

The Tuscan wise men declared that the prodigy foretold a change of conditions and the advent of a new age. For according to them there are eight ages in all, differing from one another in the lives and customs of men, and to each of these God has appointed a definite number of times and seasons, which is completed by the circuit of a great year. And whenever this circuit has run out, and another begins, some wonderful sign is sent from earth or heaven, so that it is at once clear to those who have studied such subjects and are versed in them, that men of other habits and modes of life have come into the world, who are either more or less of concern to the gods than their predecessors were. All things, they say, undergo great changes, as one age succeeds another, and especially the art of divination; at one period it rises in esteem and is successful in its predictions, because manifest and genuine signs are sent forth from the Deity; and again, in another age, it is in small repute, being off-hand, for the most part, and seeking to grasp the future by means of faint and blind senses. Such, at any rate, was the tale told by the wisest of the Tuscans, who were thought to know much more about it than the rest. Moreover, while the senate was busied with the soothsayers about these prodigies, and holding its session in the temple of Bellona, a sparrow came flying in, before the eyes of all, with a grasshopper in its mouth, a part of which it threw down and left there, and then went away with the other part. From this the diviners apprehended a quarrelsome dissension between the landed proprietors and the populace of the city and forum; for the latter is vociferous like a grasshopper, while the former haunt the fields [?] (like the sparrow).¹⁵

Perhaps through a confusion of the kinds of divination, perhaps through the contamination of Greek ideas, a change in the very notion of the prodigy has taken place, the effect of which is seen here. While in primitive times the science of haruspication was confined to determining the required *procuratio*, it now resolves another question: what does the prodigy foretell, *quid portentat prodigium*? Another change is interdependent with this one. In Rome at least, the prodigy is in every circumstance a frightening thing, a sign of divine wrath; during the second century, in the course of a highly

15. On the doctrine of this consultation, see below, p. 668, n. 93.

interesting rivalry between the decemvirs and the haruspices, the idea of a happy prodigy makes an appearance. The year is 172, on the eve of the war with Perseus, king of Macedonia (Liv. 42.20.1):

In a city which was at the highest pitch of excitement about the new war, during a storm at night the *columna rostrata* which had been set up on the Capitol in the first Punic war in honour of the victory of the consul Marcus Aemilius, whose colleague was Servius Fulvius, was completely destroyed by lightning. This event was regarded as a prodigy and was referred to the senate; the Fathers ordered that the matter should be referred to the haruspices and, moreover, that the decemvirs should consult the Books. The decemvirs reported back that the city should be purified, that a period of supplication and prayer should be held and that sacrifices of full-grown victims [*victimae maiores*] should be offered both on the Capitol at Rome and in Campania at the promontory of Minerva; further, that at the earliest possible moment games for ten days should be celebrated in honour of Jupiter Optimus Maximus. All these directions were scrupulously obeyed. The haruspices pronounced that this omen would turn out for the best [*in bonum uersurum*], and that an extension of frontiers and the destruction of the enemy were foretold, because those beaks [*rostra*, ships' prows] which the storm had overthrown had been spoils taken from the enemy.

A science as painstaking, as subtle, and as eloquent as this quickly became indispensable. During the civil wars the generals kept haruspices on their staffs and made them investigate the bowels of victims on the eve of major decisions. But at the same time, having to meet too great a demand, the science became debased. In order to preserve its gravity, probably in the second century B.C., in the period when Cato expressed surprise that two haruspices could look at each other without laughing (Cic. *Diu.* 2.51), the Senate made a curious decision, which we know through Cicero (*Diu.* 1.92):¹⁶ “In Rome’s greatest days, the Senate declared that from each of the peoples of Etruria six (?) sons of noble families should be chosen and consecrated to this study, in order that such an important art should not be abandoned to men of no account, thereby losing its religious dignity and degenerating into a mere matter for personal gain.” On that day, says Bouché-Leclercq, the Senate acted with great naiveté if it imagined that it could impose an obligatory course of instruction whose results nobody at Rome was capable of checking.

16. See below, p. 660, n. 79.

Like the science of the auspices, that of the prodigies was further discredited, during the period of civil disorders, by the use or abuse made of it, first by the political parties and then by the "providential men." The brave Caius Gracchus paid no attention to it: probably he knew that the prodigies were too amenable to the inspirations of his adversaries. While he was building the *colonia Junonia* on the site of Carthage, an undertaking which was severely criticized at Rome, a sudden gust of wind fell upon the first ensign, and as the ensign-bearer endeavored to hold it fast, the staff broke, while the wind blew away the *exta* which were laid upon the altar, carrying them beyond the bounds laid out for the newborn city; then wolves came and carried away the very stakes that were set up to show the boundary. Gracchus nevertheless dispatched his labors, and seventy days later was able to take ship for Rome. It is true that death awaited him there (Plut. *C. Gr.* 11.1).

NOTES ON THE PRIVATE CULTS

The *uillica* should not perform a sacrifice, nor have it performed by anybody else without the order of the master or the mistress: *scito dominum pro tota familia rem diuinam facere*. This rule, enunciated by Cato (*Agr.* 143), holds not only for the *familia rustica* and for the villa: it is the basis of all the forms of private cults. Wherever such a cult exists, it is the head of the group who, in the name of the group, is in charge of the religious matters. He has this charge by virtue of his position, and also as the trustee of a tradition, as one of the successive representatives of authority. We have seen these two components being organized in the idea of the Genius, which properly dominates the domestic cult.¹ Another rule, complementary to this, is very generally respected: the state does not interfere in the private cults, on condition that they do not disturb the order or conflict with the public cults. When consulted, its priests reply, but they allow complete freedom to the consultant.

In the home, besides the Genius of the master,² the *Lar domesticus* and the *Penates* complete the ordinary cult. Its center, the hearth, was in primitive times in the atrium, the common room, which it blackened with its smoke. When images of these gods were made, it was here that they were placed. Here too was where the *pater* said

1. Above, pp. 357-61.

2. The basic book on the domestic cult is still A. de Marchi's *Il Culto privato di Roma antica*, 2 vols. (1896-1903); see also N. Turchi, *La religione di Roma antica* (1932), pp. 11-34 ("Il culto privato"), and U. E. Paoli, *Vita romana* (translated into French by J. Rebertat) (1955), *passim*. A great deal of information, going beyond the subject of the title, and a rich bibliography can be found in W. Deonna and M. Renard, *Croyances et superstitions de table dans la Rome antique*, *Coll. Lat.* 46 (1961).

the family prayer and where, before the meal, he offered the household gods the first helpings of food and drink from the nearby table. On the three calendar days of the month, on anniversaries, and especially on the master's *dies natalis*, it was here that the most costly offerings were brought: garlands of flowers, incense, perfumes, wine, honey, and cakes—which certain Lares, like the one in the Aulularia, enjoyed every day, through the devotion of a young girl. Later the gods were lodged in other parts of the house, or a little *sacrarium* was built for them in the common room. But neither the spirit nor the forms of the cult were changed thereby. The members of the family sufficed to assist the *pater* in these simple and generally bloodless rites. When more help was needed, the petty specialists of the *insula*, the district, hired out their services; such was the *papa*, or the garrulous old woman of whom Ovid speaks (*F.* 2.571-72):

*Ecce anus in mediis residens annosa puellis
sacra facit Tacitae, uix tamen ipsa tacet.*

In this domestic life, the only unexpected events were accidental defilements and their mystical cleansing, the recipes for which must have been as varied as they are in every folklore. A gloss by Festus (p. 318 L²) has preserved several names of "the priestess" who was ordinarily called in, along with her arsenal of *purgamenta*: *piatrix* and *expiatrix*, but also *simpulatrix* (from *simpulum*, the name of a vessel used for libations of wine, *ibid.* p. 455) and *saga* (cf. *ibid.* pp. 414-15); we also know the name of the specialist in sacrifices which had to be performed near lightning-struck trees, *strufertarius* (*ibid.* p. 394). The lucky chance which saved Cato's book has made us better informed regarding rustic rituals than city rituals, which were assuredly on the same level. And what do we find in Cato? What has particularly been remarked, because in this use evidences of the oldest meanings of these gods have been mistakenly seen, is the use made by the peasant in some circumstances of the principal figures of Roman theology, Jupiter and Mars:³ the warrior Mars, when he is concerned to protect his property, his cattle, himself, and his family against all dangers, seen and unseen (141); Jupiter, god of the sky and of the storm, but also supreme lord, whom the peasant treats as a distinguished guest with a *daps* before sowing his millet, panic grass,

3. Above, pp. 182-86 and 231-36.

garlic, and lentils (132);⁴ the supreme Jupiter again, with Janus, the god of beginnings, who are invoked, by an obvious expediency, in the *præfationes* of a few prayers, with Juno in third place in the single *præfatio* of the offering to Ceres (134).

It is natural for the peasant, like every Roman, to manifest his reverence for the great gods and to ask them to orient their sovereign, warlike, initiatory, or life-giving action toward the matters which concern him. Ceres, the goddess of vegetable processes, and Silvanus, the god of woodland pastures, are more directly in his domain, and he does not fail to address to them the greater part of his offerings: the *exta* of the *porca præcidanea* before the harvests of spelt, wheat, barley, beans, and rape seed (134); and considerable quantities of food and wine *pro bubus uti ualeant* (83). But in reading this venerable treatise, what is especially striking is less these few rituals by which the gods benefit than the magical, anonymous recipes which are intermingled with the technical recipes and which claim, like them, to be based on experience. In the life of the *uillicus* "Manlius" just as in the life, until quite recent times, of European villages, these recipes formed an essential part of the relations between man and the supernatural. Thus winter work should not be done except in the dark of the moon or in one of the quarters (37); if one has reason to fear sickness among the oxen, one must compound a mixture of ingredients counted by threes (three laurel leaves, three grains of incense, three live coals, etc.) and administer it to each ox from a wooden vessel for three days, and divide it in such a way that when each has received three doses there will be none left over; moreover, while one gathers, grinds, and administers this potion one must be standing and also fasting. Similarly, when an animal begins to sicken, administer while standing one raw hen's egg, and make him swallow it whole, and on the following day a head of onion crushed in wine (70, 71). And, immediately after the long hymn in praise of the medicinal qualities of that true panacea, the cabbage, and of the urine of persons who have eaten cabbage (157), we read an astonishing recipe for a purgative: a broth of lean ham to which are added two small cabbage heads, various vegetables, a scorpion, six snails, and a handful of lentils. Next we read of charms for cases of dislocation

4. In the preceding chapter (131), the *daps pro bubus* is apparently a separate occasion; Jupiter is not named there.

and fracture: for the former, while two men hold the two halves of a green reed to your hips, chant the words *motas uaeta daries dardaries astataries dissunapiter*; for the latter, the formula is the same, or else *huat hauat ista pista sista dannabo dannaustra*; or again the variant *huat haut haut istasis tarsis ardannabou dannaustra* (160). Such must have been the basis of the magico-religious life of the countryfolk,⁵ from which the somewhat more religious rituals stood out, such as those of the lopping of trees (*lucum conlucare*, 139) or the clearing of ground (*fodere*, 140). Before thinning the grove, one should offer a pig as *piaculum*. To whom? Here is the prayer, filled with precautions and specifications worthy of a *pater patratus*: "Whether thou be god or goddess to whom this grove is dedicated, allow as just compensation the pig which is offered to thee as *piaculum* for touching this sacred place; allow what is done with this intention to be lawful, whether I do it myself, or someone else at my bidding . . ." Before clearing the ground, the same *piaculum* is recommended and the same prayer, with the addition of three words, *operis faciundi causa*. Finally, one must work every day without interruption; if one misses a day because of public or domestic *feriae*, the effect of the *piaculum* is broken and a new offering must be made.

In these rituals we do not find the learned retinue of Ceres, the group of Vervactor, etc., of whom in later times the Christian polemicists made fun and in whom today's primitivists seek the earliest form of religious representations. It is probable that the peasant himself barely knew of them. They were an analytical refinement which he left to the flamen of the goddess. When Cato minutely describes the method of building the villa, it never occurs to him to recommend the propitiation of such *minuti et obscurissimi* personages as Forculus, the patron of the *fores*, Cardea, the patroness of hinges, Limentinus, the patron of the threshold, and all the other "gods" to whom, according to Servius (*Aen.* 2.469), the *singula membra domus* were consecrated: these too he left to pontifical science. The same comment holds true for the many pseudo-divinities who supposedly governed the life of the family, from the wedding night of the parents

5. For another, wider definition of Roman magic, see R. Schilling, "Magie et religion à Rome," *Annuaire de l'Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes* (Section V, Religious Sciences), 1967-68, pp. 31-55. See also E. E. Burriss, *Tabou, Magic, Spirits: A Study of Primitive Elements in Roman Religion* (1931).

to the attendance at school of the child: if no author, in any literary genre, has thought to mention them, it is because they were not part of everyday religious practice.⁶

At Rome marriage was normally a private affair. On the one hand, its three legal forms, in which there is no reason for imagining a chronological order, and, on the other, its religious rites show important agreements with the usage of India. All the varieties of marriage which fill the Indian classifications, at least those which are considered "good," amount to three: above all, the brahmanic marriage, the purest and most sacred (with some simplified forms); the marriage by pretended purchase, in which the father of the bride receives symbolic gifts from the groom, which he later gives back to the new household; and finally, marriage in the manner of the Gandharva, in which the young man and woman are joined together of their own free will, and which can be broken—in the legends—by the violation of a Melusinian agreement. The principles of these three types of union strongly resemble those of *confarreatio*, *coemptio*, and *usus*. Only *confarreatio* was defined by religious features which implied the participation of the state: the highest priests were involved in it, and the bride and groom were joined *per fruges et molam salsam* (Serv. Georg. 1.31) and also by water and fire (Serv. Aen. 4.105), perhaps with an animal sacrifice (ibid. 4.374). This type of marriage was required for the *rex sacrorum* and the *flamines maiores*, and even doubly required, since they had to be the sons of *farreati* as well as *farreati* themselves; nowadays it is generally thought that it was practiced only in a very small number of cases. *Coemptio* and *usus* were answerable only to the *ius ciuile*. But all three forms were religiously placed under the patronage of Juno Pronuba and included rites which, in the case of *confarreatio*, seem to have been added to those of the constitutive act of marriage. Moreover, the bride, when she made her first entrance into the house of her husband, brought to it three *us*, one in her hand, which she gave to her husband; the second on her foot, which she placed on the hearth "of the *Lares familiares*"; and the last in a purse, which she jingled (?) at the neighboring crossroads (Non. p. 852 L). In this way she incorporated herself in her household, her home, and her neighborhood. Like all the major decisions of

6. Above, pp. 33–38.

life, marriage naturally called for the taking of auspices: such was in fact, on the testimony of Cicero, the *mos ueterum* (Diu. 1.104).⁷

Juno Lucina watched over childbirth more surely than the brave band of her *indigitamenta*. As soon as it was born, the child was placed on the ground *ut auspicaretur rectus esse*, and a "lectisternium," probably in ancient times a less pretentious offering, was presented to Pilumnus and Picumnus, the gods of babies (Serv. *Aen.* 10.76); later, in the noble families, these rustic gods were replaced by Juno and Hercules. Varro (in Aug. *Ciu. D.* 6.9.2) mentioned another rite for the protection of the newly delivered mother in which Pilumnus again appears; three gods were charged with preventing Silvanus from coming to trouble the night:

To represent the three guardian gods, three men go about the thresholds of the house at night and strike the threshold first with an axe, next with a pestle, and in the third place sweep it with a broom. These symbols of agriculture prevent Silvanus from entering—for trees are not cut down or pruned without iron tools, nor is grain ground without a pestle, nor is the harvested grain collected in a heap without a broom. From these operations three gods get their names: Intercidona from cutting down (*intercisio*) with an axe, Pilumnus from the pestle, Deverra from the broom. These gods were the guardians by whom the new mother was to be preserved from attack by the god Silvanus.

Perhaps the Christian doctor gives a faulty interpretation of the names, but the rite is certainly authentic. If the day of birth and its anniversary are *feriae familiares*, the *dies lustricus*—the ninth for boys, the eighth for girls—which marks the child's entrance into the life of society is no less important, involving sacrifices about which we have no information (Tert. *Idol.* 16). Later, generally in the seventeenth year, a sacrifice also accompanied the *sollemnitatis togae purae*, that is, the transition from *puer* to *iuuenis*, the taking of the manly toga, which occurred on the Liberalia of 17 March (Ov. *F.* 3.771–78). The boy put off the marks of childhood, the amulet which he consecrated to the Lares (Pers. 5.32) and the purple *toga praetexta*. This time the sacrifice was performed away from home, in the temple of Jupiter

7. On Mutunus Tutunus and his ritual in connection with the mystical dangers of the first sexual intercourse, see Wiss., p. 243; on Pilumnus and Picumnus, *di coniugales, infantium di*, *ibid.*, p. 244. On marriage, Gordon Williams, "Some Aspects of Roman Marriage Ceremonies and Ideals," *JRS* 48 (1958): 16–29.

O.M. on the Capitol, to the goddess Juventas (Serv. Ecl. 4.50), into whose coffer, according to Dionysius of Halicarnassus (4.15.5), the person concerned dropped a piece of money.

In the death of a man, the ancient Romans were concerned with his disappearance from this world rather than his entry into the next, regarding which, as we have seen, they had only very confused ideas.⁸ Above all, death was a defilement for the living, and it was this defilement that they endeavored to remove by the performance of certain rites (*iusta facere*): the sacrifice of a sow, *porca praesentanea*, offered to Ceres, partly in the presence of the corpse (Fest. p. 357 L²); the interment of the body or, in cases of cremation, of a finger saved for this purpose (*os resectum*); the meal eaten on the grave, probably on the day of burial itself (*silicernium*); a special sweeping of the house after the departure of the corpse, and the purification (*suffitio*) by fire and water of those who had taken part in the funeral procession (Paul. p. 94 L²; cf. p. 194 s.v. *exfir*); the *sacrificium nouendiale* (Porphyr. in Hor. Ep. 17.48) and the funeral banquet (Cic. Mur. 36.75), nine days after the start of mourning. Is it necessary to distinguish from these final rites the *feriae denicales*, the festival which released the survivors from the *nex* of the dead man, and after which the family became once more *pura* (Paul. p. 180 L²) and could concern itself with the inheritance?⁹ As for the worship of its dead, somewhat lost as they were in the immense mass of the "divine" Manes, the family took care of it adequately in the ceremonies ordered by the public ferial, from the Parentalia on 13 February to the Feralia of 21 February.

It was in these circumstances and a few others that the distinction between the public and the private cult extenuated: the former established the date and included official ceremonies which were accompanied, more freely, by other ceremonies at every hearth and at every grave. The Feralia were extended by the Caristia, or *cara cognatio*, of 22 February, in which the affection and harmony of the surviving relatives were displayed (Val. Max. 2.1.8).¹⁰ The *populuria sacra* (Fest. p. 357 L²) were instances of these mixed celebrations:

8. Above, pp. 363-65.

9. Another solution in Latte, p. 102, n. 2 (using Cic. Leg. 2.55): the *denicales feriae* might be the time during which the *feneſta* family must abstain from working (*residere*).

10. Above, pp. 366-67.

in the Fornacalia, the Parilia, the Terminalia, and the Compitalia, in the festivals of the vineyard and of wine, the public rites disintegrated into a great number of operations, extending across the divisions of society down to the smallest unit, the home.

The limited participation of servants and slaves was an apparently ancient feature of domestic religion. Not only did the Genius of the master concern Cato's *uillicus* and *uillica*, giving them the opportunity, the obligation to show their devotion, but even their small part in the cult was specified by the master: *in compito et in foco* for the former (5), the care of the *focus* for the latter, as well as the job of decorating it with garlands on the Calends, the Ides, and the Nones and on the *dies festi* (143). More remarkable was their role on two important occasions, the Matronalia of 1 March and the Saturnalia of 17 December. The day of the Matronalia was set apart for the mothers of families; they climbed the Esquiline to the temple of Juno Lucina, of which this was the *dies natalis*. At home, their husbands prayed *pro conseruatione coniugii* (Schol. Hor. *Carm.* 3.8) and loaded them with presents and pocket money, while the women themselves prepared a banquet with their own hands for the *serui* (Macr. 1.12.7)—the male *serui*, according to the specification of Lydus (*Mens.* 3.22). On the Saturnalia, homage was paid by the masters themselves, *domini*, to the slaves (Macr., Lyd. loc. cit.): the latter were honored with *dapes* and were served before their masters, who waited for a second serving (Macr. 1.23.24), unless they shared the first in brotherhood, *serui cum dominis* (Justin. 43.1).

Domestic religion—and all the private religions—was just as dependent on the signs of the gods as the religion of the state. "Almost nothing of importance," says Cicero, "not even *priuatum*, was done without the auspices, *nisi auspicato*" (*Diu.* 1.28), and when Cato (*Agr.* 5) forbids the *uillicus* to consult any kind of interpreter of these signs, he is evidently trying to prevent traffic with expensive charlatans rather than condemning the principle of sacred information. The existence of private experts who gave themselves the name of *augures* seems certain, both from Cato's text and from the fact that the officials of the state college are sometimes specifically designated *augures publici* (Varr. *L.L.* 5.33; Fest. p. 352, cf. p. 114 L²). We have no further information regarding their rites. The taking of

auspices at least required the same basic condition as that demanded by the magistrates and the priests, *silentium*, and allowed the same fortunate restrictions (*quod ego non sensi nullum mihi uitium facit*). A valuable fragment from Cato, preserved by Festus (p. 342 L²), gives us a crude insight into the privacy of the *pater familias*:

When we take the auspices at home . . . , if a male or female slave should fart under his clothing, and if I pay no attention to it, this in no way invalidates my act. Similarly, if it happens that a male or female slave should do that which normally puts a stop to the Comitia, even that does not invalidate my act . . .

Another gloss by Festus, unfortunately badly mutilated (p. 438 L²), lets us see something of the ritual.

Silentio surgere, says [Verrius Flaccus], is used in speaking of a man who gets out of bed in silence, after midnight, to take the auspices, and who, after leaving his bed, takes his place and remains seated on a solid chair, taking care (?) until such time as he returns to bed not to overturn anything during this whole time: for the *silentium* is the absence of anything which might vitiate the auspices.

The thunderbolt also provided indications of the will of the gods to individuals, but this was probably part of the somewhat debased Etruscan science (Plin. *N.H.* 2.138). As for the *haruspices*, we have seen that they found enough business in Rome to keep them from returning to their own country. Long before Juvenal's amusing portrayal (6.396) of a *haruspex* suffering from varicose veins as a result of having to stand while he answered his consultants, Plautus (*Curc.* 483-84) showed another offering his services in the streets of the Velabrum next door to the baker and the butcher. These techniques must have involved a whole system of transposition from public to private affairs; in connection with the *exta*, a gloss by Festus gives an idea of this system (p. 389 L²):

Regalia exta: this is the name given to the entrails of victims which promise to persons in power an unexpected honor; to private persons and those in modest circumstances, inheritances; and to the son of a family, the rank of head of the family.

The prodigies noted by individuals were not all retained, *suscepta*, by the public authorities and treated as such. Those which were not

so honored remained in the charge of those citizens who had observed them. They called for a *procuratio priuati portenti*, and Livy mentions, among the few functions of the *pontifex maximus* which he cites, the duty of giving advice, evidently to the *priuati*, concerning funeral rites, and the means of propitiating the dead, and of deciding "what prodigies manifested by lightning or other visible sign were to be taken in hand and averted" (1.20.7).

If one adds the "Chaldeans," the readers of horoscopes, the interpreters of dreams, and the soothsayers of every description who came, in the course of the last centuries, to seek their fortune in the capital of the world, one catches a glimpse of the form of religion which more and more tended to duplicate and to becloud the old practices, which were by comparison quite reasonable. At the end of the *De diuinatione* (2.149-50), in a sentence heavy with experience, even though somewhat rhetorical, Cicero shows the average Roman as the prey of superstition:

... For superstition is ever at your heels to urge you on; it follows you at every turn. It is with you when you listen to a prophet, or an omen; when you offer sacrifices or watch the flight of birds; when you consult a Chaldaean or a haruspex; when it thunders or lightens or there is a bolt from on high; or when some so-called prodigy is born or is made. And since necessarily some of these signs are nearly always being given, no one who believes in them can ever remain in a tranquil state of mind. Sleep is regarded as a refuge from every toil and care; but it is actually made the fruitful source of worry and fear.

Many decent persons in our own times live in the same way: seers, quacks, and fortune-tellers still carry on the old tradition earnestly and profitably.

Every group, whether intermediate between the *domus* and the state, such as the *uici* and the *pagi*, the *gentes* and the *curiae*, or particular and specialized, like the artisans' guilds or, later, the military units, and even the largest natural or conventional classes of the population—men in their quality as men, women as women, plebeians as opposed to patricians, foreigners, freedmen—all had their own cults, in which at times the distinction between public and private was not clear. Even though they were regarded in principle as nothing, both individually and collectively, the very slaves sometimes had

their own centers of worship, beyond the subordinate functions which many of them performed in the religion of the state and in the private cults: a recent study has just broached this subject, which has been too long neglected.¹¹ It is impossible to survey so many headings here. I shall confine myself to characterizing two of them, in broad strokes, the cults of the *gentes* and those of the artisans' guilds.

The *gentes*, at least the great patrician *gentes*, had traditional cults, the ritual formulas of which belonged to them. During the siege of the Capitol by the Gauls, one of the young Fabii was cited as an example of bravery and luck because he had gone as far as the Quirinal to perform certain *sacra* of his *gens* (Liv. 5.46.2). It has been suggested with some likelihood that the surname of one branch of the Lucretii, *Tricipitinus*, contained an allusion to a cult. The Claudian *gens* had a special kind of victim, bearing the name of *propudialis porcus*, which it used as a *piamentum* and as an *exsolutio omnis contractae religionis* (Fest. p. 345 L²). And there must be some truth in the tradition which made the state the successor and the substitute of two *gentes*, the Potitii and the Pinarii, at the Ara Maxima.¹² Sometimes, even though it respected the autonomy of the family cult, the state took an interest in it. The Aurelian *gens*, the "Auselii," of Sabine origin, bore the sun in its name and offered sacrifices to it for which the Roman people had officially granted a plot of ground (Fest. p. 120 L²). It is probable that the annual ceremony of the *tigillum sororium*, so astonishingly treated by modern criticism, was really, as the tradition claims, the extension of a ritual of purification for the returning warrior, and that it was at the same time peculiar to the Horatian *gens* and of public utility. It is also probable that the two teams which form the sodality of the Luperci, the Quinctiales and the Fabii, were originally furnished by the Quinctii and the Fabii: Mommsen remarked that the rare given name *Kaeso* occurred only in these two *gentes* and compared it with the act of *februus caedere* which characterizes one of the chief moments of the Lupercalia. Because the *gens* had no proper head, it seems to have chosen, not for life, one of its members (if we may use Dion. 6.69.1, who speaks of a rotation among the Nautii), and to have charged him with the *sacra gentilicia*, sacrifices or sacred meals, which required the

11. Above, p. 529, n. 2.

12. Above, pp. 435-36.

presence of only a small number of participants, three or four (Dion. 9.19.3). Crossing over from one *gens* to another involved a *detestatio sacrorum*, a public renunciation of the *sacra*, which took place in the *comitia calata*.

The *collegia artificum* or *opificum*, which a materially false but ideologically interesting tradition¹³ attributed to Numa (Plut. *Num.* 17), were presided over, like the sodalities, by a *magister*. We know little of their life before the Empire. The greater number had the Quinquatrus of 19 March as their festival, in honor of Minerva, the patron goddess of the crafts. In a list which is not exhaustive, Ovid (*F.* 3.809–32) names on this occasion the weavers, the fullers, the dyers, the cobblers, the doctors, the schoolmasters, the sculptors, and the painters. The flute-players, who were particularly useful to religion, held their *agapae* in the temple of Capitoline Jupiter (Liv. 9.30.5 and 10), but also worshipped Minerva in the Minusculae Quinquatrus on the Ides of June (*Fest.* p. 267 L²). The fishermen and divers of the Tiber (*CIL*, VI, 1872) seem to have been the participants in the *ludi piscatorii* on 7 June (*Fest.* p. 345, cf. p. 318 L²), while those who worked with water, *qui artificium aqua exercent*, feasted Juturna (Serv. *Aen.* 12.139).

13. "Métiers et classes fonctionnelles chez divers peuples indo-européens," *Annales: Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 9 (1954): 716–24.

APPENDIX

THE RELIGION OF THE ETRUSCANS

INTRODUCTION

It is customary for "the religion of the Etruscans" to be treated in the same volume with Roman religion, and to be treated first, as a kind of necessary introduction. This tradition has not been maintained here: even though the two religions are discussed within the same covers, Rome is considered first, and Etruria is accorded only the pages of an appendix. The reasons for this order and this reapportionment are as follows.¹

The picture of Roman religion which has been presented in the foregoing pages shows clearly that Rome's debt to Etruria is not so great as it is usually portrayed. When the Romans and the other Latins settled in Italy, they were in possession of a well-structured system of beliefs and rites inherited from their Indo-European past. The Etruscan contribution, no matter how early, important, and repeated, if not continuous, it may have been, only enriched this structure without dislocating it.

Indeed we may say that it is rather this reconstruction of Roman religion in its original form which helps to clarify Etruscan religion, or at least to make clear that which distinguishes the one from the other. The theologies of Umbria, if we knew them, would be more useful for this clarification; but the Italic context, even when confined to Rome, remains the best instrument for appreciating the documents relating to Etruria.

In the third place, the fundamental documentation of Etruscan religion is found in Latin authors, starting with the first century B.C.; in other words, it dates from a period when Rome was wide open to the whole world, to the East as well as to Greece. The scholars

1. For a brief list of the literature dealing with the Etruscans and their religion, see below, pp. 695-96. Many of the works mentioned there are cited in the footnotes to this Appendix.

of that time who cited Etruscan facts and translated Etruscan "books" were aware of something besides those facts and were concerned with something besides those books. Frequently they rethought, extended, or warped the tradition which they were using or which they wished to save. It is necessary to make a constant critical effort to place ourselves at this crossroads of the world which the former fief of the Tarquins had become.

Finally, despite a considerable body of work, Etruscan religion remains obscure. When we speak of it, we are obliged to dwell on its best-known aspects, notably the various forms of divination which were of particular interest to the officials and the scholars of Rome. But this emphasis certainly unbalances our survey, at the expense of theology, the most important element of any religion, and at the expense of the calendar festivals, of which we are almost wholly ignorant. It is a risky business to try to describe the religion of a people whose texts are incomprehensible, a religion which no ancient author attempted to characterize as a whole, if only in a few lines, as Herodotus and his epigones did so admirably for the Scythians, the Thracians, and for a number of other barbarian peoples. Now, even though Etruscan is written in an alphabet which holds no mysteries, even though we have, in addition to thousands of short inscriptions, a few sizable texts which seem to treat of religious or magical matters, they are closed books to us and cannot be used, because we do not understand the Etruscan language.

For more than a century, whether by an internal analysis of forms (based on the method of combination), which inevitably becomes arbitrary as soon as it passes from statistics to interpretation, or by the quickly maddening comparison of ancient or modern languages carelessly supposed to be related to Etruscan, how much ingenuity and patience, and often true learning, have been expended to resolve an insoluble problem!² It is heartbreaking that the Roman grammarians did not leave us, instead of isolated glosses, the equivalent of those

2. See the examination of methods and an optimistic evaluation of results in M. Pallottino's *Elementi di lingua etrusca* (1936), and in the final, linguistic chapters of *Etruscologia*. F. Ribezzo's article, "A che punto siamo con l'interpretazione del etrusco?" *SE* 22 (1952-53): 101-28, is a typical example of the illusions to which so many researchers abandon themselves. G. Devoto's position is summed up in "Etrusco e peri-indoeuropeo," *SE* 18 (1944): 184-97, and 31 (1962): 93-98; "Umbri ed Etruschi," *SE* 28 (1966): 263-76.

bilingual vocabularies which are the pride of Babylonian scholarship; heartbreaking too that the bilingual inscriptions, in Latin and Etruscan, consisting only of proper names and nouns indicating relationship or function, tell us so little. Nevertheless, such is the situation, and the illusions under which so many Etruscologists labor, the heated affirmations which we sometimes read from the pen of the most sensible men, do not change it in any way. The few score words whose meaning is certain or probable, and the few morphological features which can be determined do not allow the translation of a single sentence of the large texts. With such an unfamiliar language, progress is possible only if one discovers bilingual inscriptions of some length or if one can establish a definite and close relationship between it and some known ancient language.

The discovery of bilingual inscriptions is not a matter of calculation or design, but depends rather on the chances of an excavation or on the lucky stroke of a farmer's pickaxe. One of these chances occurred recently, but it is too soon to evaluate its results. In July 1964, on the site of one of the two ports of the Etruscan town of Caere, modern Cervetri, Massimo Pallottino unearthed three golden lamellae bearing inscriptions, one in Punic (11 lines), the other two in Etruscan (16 and 9 lines).³ Although it is not exactly a question of bilingual versions, it seems that the longer Etruscan inscription and the Punic one contain parallel material: the same man's name and the same divinity appear in the first lines. The Punic text, which was read immediately by G. Levi Della Vida, and later by G. Garbini,⁴ has been interpreted with greater resourcefulness by A. Dupont-Sommer,⁵ and it is possible to think that the essential facts about it have been stated. One must have faith in the ability of the Etruscologists

3. M. Pallottino, with the collaboration of G. Colonna, L. V. Borrelli, and G. Garbini, "Scavi nel santuario etrusco di Pyrgi, relazione preliminare della settima campagna, 1964, e scoperta di tre lamine d'oro iscritte in etrusco e punico," *Archeologia classica* 16 (1964): 49-117 (pls XXV-XXXIX); see the annual reports on the excavations at Pyrgi in the preceding volumes of the same review. Work in the field is going on, as well as efforts to interpret the lamellae and the events relating to them.

4. Pallottino et al., "Scavi nel santuario etrusco di Pyrgi," pp. 66-76.

5. "L'inscription punique récemment découverte à Pyrgi (Italie)," *JA* 252 (1964): 289-302. See the later bibliography in J. Heurgon's notes, "The Inscriptions of Pyrgi," *JRS* 56 (1965): 1-14. Along with the three golden lamellae there was found, in fragments, a bronze inscribed lamella on which *tinas* occurs twice and *uneia* once, bringing together "Jupiter" and Juno in a temple of the latter. This might be important, but is *tinas* a god's name or a form of *tin* "day"? See below, pp. 680-82.

to utilize the lessons of grammar and vocabulary which this little treasure conceals. The first examination, cautiously published by Pallottino toward the end of 1964,⁶ is certainly not discouraging, but it has shown above all the difficulties of the task: no probable solution was reached.

The discovery of a language related to Etruscan, on the other hand, is a matter of intuition and critical insight. Moreover, it involves the problem, vigorously discussed even in recent times, of the origin of the Etruscan people. Increasingly authors are abandoning the theories of "autochthony" and "continental migration"⁷ and returning to the tradition reported, in a legendary form, by Herodotus (1.94) and, after him, by the majority of the writers of antiquity. Speaking of the Lydians, the Father of History says that they claim to have invented almost all the games played by the Greeks, and to have done this at the time when "Tyrrhenia was colonized":⁸

... In the reign of Atys son of Manes there was great scarcity of food in all Lydia. For a while the Lydians bore this with what patience they could; presently, when there was no abatement of the famine, they sought for remedies, and divers plans were devised by divers men. Then it was that they invented the games of dice and knuckle-bones and ball, and all other forms of pastime except only draughts, which the Lydians do not claim to have discovered. Thus, using their discovery to lighten the famine, they would play for the whole of every other day, that they might not have to seek for food, and the next day they ceased from their play and ate. This was their manner of life for eighteen years. But the famine did not cease to plague them, and

6. "Scavi nel santuario etrusco di Pyrgi," pp. 76-104.

7. A good criticism of these two hypotheses can be found in A. Piganiol, "Les Etrusques, peuple d'Orient," *Cahiers d'histoire mondiale* 1 (1953): 329-39; the constructive part (notably the "Chaldean" hypothesis, pp. 337-38), is less fortunate. Of course, to admit the Anatolian origin of the Etruscans, i.e., of the aristocracy who imposed their language on the country (like the Saxons in Great Britain), does not imply that one denies an Italic substratum; only archaeology gives access to this substratum, and the archaeologists, though in agreement on the facts, differ considerably in their interpretation. There is a good summing up in chapter 2 of the *Etruscologia* of M. Pallottino ("Il problema delle origini etrusche"), who would certainly not agree to be classed among the holders of the thesis "Les Etrusques, peuple d'Orient"; cf. his book *L'origine degli Etruschi* (1947) and his article "Erodoto autoctonista?" *SE* 20 (1948-49): 11-16. Among most recent essays (with very diverse orientations), see P. Bosch-Gimpera, "Réflexions sur le problème des Etrusques," *Mélanges A. Piganiol* (1966), pp. 637-43; H. Hencken, "A View of Etruscan Origins," *Antiquity* 46 (1966): 105-211, and *Tarquinia, Villanovans and Early Etruscans* 1-2 (1966); Scullard, "Two Halicarnassians and a Lydian: Note on Etruscan Origins," *Studies Presented to V. Ehrenberg* (1966), pp. 225-31.

8. There is no reason to believe that Herodotus got this legend from the Phocians of Marseille.

rather afflicted them yet more grievously. At last their king divided the people into two portions, and made them draw lots, so that the one part should remain and the other leave the country; he himself was to be the head of those who drew the lot to remain there, and his son, whose name was Tyrrhenus, of those who departed. Then one part of them, having drawn the lot, left the country and came down to Smyrna and built ships whereon they set all their goods that could be carried on shipboard and sailed away to seek a livelihood and a country; till at last, after sojourning with many nations in turn, they came to the Ombrici, where they founded cities and have dwelt ever since. They no longer called themselves Lydians, but Tyrrhenians, after the name of the king's son who had led them thither.

The overseas, Anatolian, Lydian origin of the Etruscans has been confirmed for many years by linguistic considerations. In 1886, when the French archaeologists G. Cousin and F. Durrbach published in the *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* their discovery of the preceding year—at Kaminia, on the island of Lemnos, a funerary stele bearing two inscriptions in an unknown idiom—it was apparent that the general aspect of the language and a number of specific words, occurring in the expected places, recalled Etruscan and certain funerary inscriptions of Etruria.⁹ In particular, something which is very probably an indication of age (in A, *σαλχFeiζ αFiζ*; in B, *αFiζ σαλχFiζ*) corresponds on the one hand with the Etruscan indications of age, such as *avils XXV*, *avils XXXVI*, etc., and on the other hand with the Etruscan words for numbers (multiples of ten) in *-alxl* (*ce(a)lxl*, *muvalxl*, *cezpalxl*, *semfalxl*), which occur most frequently in the case in *s* after *avils* (*avils cealxls*; with the units intercalated: *avils huθs celxls*, *avils maxs semfalxls*, *avils esals cezpalxls*, *avils θunem muvalxls*, etc.). Thus we can be sure that in the seventh or sixth century men speaking a language related to Etruscan landed on or lived in Lemnos, close to the coast of Asia Minor. Excavations undertaken soon afterward in the vicinity of Kaminia brought to light a necropolis of the eighth and seventh centuries, containing many golden objects of the same type as those which adorn the Etruscan tombs of the same period.

Moreover, when Lydian inscriptions of some importance were

9. Bibliography in Johannes Friedrich, *Kleinasiatische Sprachdenkmäler* (1932), p. 144; add to this F. Ribezzo, *Rivista Indo-greco-italica* 15 (1931): 63-78; W. Brandenstein, *Die tyrrenische Stele von Lemnos* (1934); F. Hrozniý, "Die Inschrift von Lemnos," *SE* 9 (1935): 127-32.

discovered, analogies between this second unknown language and Etruscan became apparent.¹⁰ In 1916, when he published the first texts from Sardis, Enno Littmann pointed out the most striking of these analogies:¹¹ in the sound system, in the accentuation (heavy initial stress, which distorts the Greek words: Lydian *Ibsi*- *Ἰβείσος, perhaps *Timle*- *Τιμόλαος* (or *Τιμέλης*); Etruscan *Ahle* *Ἀχιλλεύς, *Lamtun* *Λαομέδων*, *Clut(u)msta* *Κλυταιμήςτρα*, etc.), and in the morphology (Lydian possessive adjectives in *l* and *s* [š], Etruscan genitive in *l*, *s*; the lack of gender; and the endings of ethnic names: Lydian *Sfardak* "of Sardis," Etruscan *Rumax* "of Rome"). But, since Lydian can barely be interpreted, despite a fine bilingual Lydian-Aramaean inscription, and since darkness cannot be lightened by darkness, the knowledge of Etruscan did not gain very much from this statement. Nevertheless, it did confirm the theory—and this is a net gain for those inquiries relating to the civilization—that the Etruscans of Italy, or at least the group of men who gave their language to the country, definitely came from Asia Minor.

The discovery and deciphering of Hittite and the languages related to it, Luwian and Palaic; and later the recognition by Holger Pedersen that one of the languages spoken much later in Asia Minor, Lycian, was an evolved form of Luwian,¹² have provided the linguists with new tools for investigation. In recent years serious reasons have been presented for thinking that Lydian, the vocabulary of which has just been published,¹³ is also an evolved form of one of the ancient languages known through the hieroglyphic and cuneiform inscriptions,

10. In 1914 G. Herbig published an important article, "Kleinasiatisch-etruskische Namengleichungen," *SBBA*, 1914, pt. 2 especially p. 10, the names in *-na*; pp. 20-21, the words with the radical *Tarqu-*, *ταρχ-*; p. 29, table of phonetic correspondences; p. 35, parallel study of dissimilations in Lycian and Etruscan. Herbig was able to use only Lycian, and merely announces, p. 7, n. 2, the forthcoming publication of Littmann; similarly J. Sundwall, *Die einheimischen Namen der Lykier nebst einem Verzeichnisse kleinasiatischer Namenstämme*, *Klio*, Beiheft 11, 1913. In the same field of research, see E. Benveniste, "Le suffixe *-umn-*," *SE* 7 (1933): 253-58 (personally, I do not believe that the god *Vertumnus* is Etruscan otherwise than by phonetic assimilation to *Veltune-Veltumna*, see above, pp. 339-40).

11. *Sardis: Publications of the American Society for the Excavation of Sardis*, vol. 6, *Lydian Inscriptions*, pt. I (1916), pp. 80-81; cf. A. O. Danielsson, *Zu den lydischen Inschriften* (1918). The continuation of the Lydian inscriptions is in *Sardis*, vol. 6, pt. II (1932) (by W. H. Buckler).

12. *Lykisch und Hittitisch*, Det kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser, vol. 30, pt. 4, 2d ed. (1949).

13. R. Gusmani, *Lydisches Wörterbuch, mit grammatischer Skizze und Inschriftensammlung*. (We now have a sixth-century inscription: note of correction.)

of a Hittite dialect.¹⁴ Now, in the coming years, we are going to be observing an operation which is the inverse (but no less exciting) of the one which allowed Champollion to interpret ancient Egyptian through its derivative Coptic, and we may hope that within the near future at least some of the secrets of the Lydian grammar and vocabulary will be revealed. Perhaps the Etruscan language will receive a reflection from this illumination of which a few glimmers may possibly be cast upon Etruscan religion.

We must, however, pay attention to dates. The Lydian which we know from the oldest inscriptions at Sardis dates from the Achaemenid era, subsequent to the fifth century B.C. Now the "Tyrrhenian" migration certainly took place several centuries earlier. It is generally believed that when Syracuse and Cumae were founded by the Greeks, in the second half of the eighth century—shortly after the birth of Rome—the Etruscans were firmly established on the coast of what was to become Etruria. Probably they had arrived sometime during the ninth century, that is, at a moment almost midway in time between the Hittite empire and the written Lydian evidences. André Piganiol, using arguments of uneven force, some of which, however, are worth taking seriously, transformed the given facts of the problem by boldly setting the migration of the "Etruscan Vikings" at about 675.¹⁵ According to him, they left Asia Minor at the time of the devastations committed by the Cimmerians and the Scythians at the end of the eighth century and during a large part of the seventh. This "short chronology" can moreover be reconciled with the earlier one: the later emigrants, perhaps more numerous, may simply have gone to enlarge the settlements already opened up by their predecessors. At any rate, in the decomposition of empires there is a rapid evolution, not only of languages but of customs and beliefs, especially in Asia Minor, where the interplay of influences has always been complex and powerful. Two centuries can bring about great differences. This explains why, at first sight, few Etruscan words recall Lydian words. Neither, it is true, do they recall Hittite words, to which, *a priori*, they should be closer.

Another possibility must also be taken into account. It should be

14. O. Carruba, "Lydisch und Lyder," *Mitteilungen der Institut für Orientforschung* 8, 3 (1963): 383-408, with the earlier bibliography.

15. "Les Etrusques, peuple d'Orient," pp. 333-36.

admitted that the name *Lydian* was applied to a composite population, in which "Hittitized" Anatolians lived side by side with other, more conservative peoples who still spoke languages or preserved words antedating the Indo-European invasions. Considering, for example, that the few known words for numbers in Lycian are thoroughly Indo-European, it is remarkable that those in Etruscan resist every effort to include them in that family. Moreover, they do not resemble any known numeral series, particularly none in the Caucasian languages.¹⁶

Although this strong probability of an Eastern origin suggests that we look in Asia Minor for the earliest bases of Etruscan beliefs, nevertheless, up to the present it has failed to yield any truly illuminating comparisons. Quite to the contrary, the specialists in the Anatolian languages and civilizations rightly warn us against the euphoric theory of the "refound kinsmen"; the kinsmen in Italy underwent great changes.

They were certainly changed by contact with the Italic peoples, especially the Umbrians, who had arrived considerably before them in what was to be Tuscany and who were not stammering barbarians, any more than were the Romans. Moreover, as a maritime people Etruscans must from the beginning have been subject to the successive waves or cross-currents of influences in the Mediterranean world: from the Phoenicians in Asia and Africa, and from the Greeks who were everywhere. It was not just the arts and the material techniques which traveled abroad: the ways of life of both peoples, their religious beliefs, their attempts at philosophy, and their magical and divinatory procedures must have influenced this new nation, descended, at least in its aristocracy, from the early peoples of Asia Minor who had shown themselves ready at all times to borrow from the West as well as from the East. In the present state of our knowledge, it is hardly paradoxical to say that the surest part of the Etruscans' Anatolian

16. Two classifications of the first six numerals, marked on the dice, are possible: one gives the meaning "five" to *huθ*—which would then correspond (though isolated in the series) to the south-Caucasic *xut-* (*x* = the sound in German *ach*); but W. Krogmann, *Glotta* 37 (1958): 150–60, relies on the equivalence *Τετράπολις* = *Ἑττηνία* and thus, with the approval of V. Pisani, *Paideia* 14 (1959): 169–72, lists the first six numbers as follows: *max θu ci huθ sa zal*; response by T. Kluge, *SE* 27 (1959): 311–12 (reaffirming his position as stated in *SE* 9 [1935]: 153–90, "Die etruskischen Zahlwörter, eine prinzipielle Untersuchung").

heritage consisted in the faculty for absorption, and consequently for transformation. The result, in the times concerning which we have a little information, is a composite balance sheet, in which it is just as difficult to achieve a chronological perspective as to pinpoint an origin. It is easy to speak of "strata," but less easy to assign a probable content to them.

With all the more reason, save perhaps in the one matter where archaeology provides abundant evidence (I mean the funeral customs and the beliefs which supported them), it is hard to get a clear idea of the local varieties which "the Etruscan religion" must surely have embraced. From the examples of Greece and Latium we know how greatly the same traditional matter can vary from city to city, in a restricted area inhabited by men speaking approximately the same language. The Juno of Veii and the Voltumna of Volsinii were probably divinities common to all Etruria, the latter at least in a certain era, but the theological facts must have been variously articulated, here and there, around the various patron divinities. Of this we know nothing.

THE "LIBRI" OF THE ETRUSCANS

One of the most striking features of the image of Etruscan religion held by the Romans at the end of the Republican era is that it was a religion of "books," and that the men responsible for these "books," even when they were mythical figures, were nonetheless their "authors." It is understandable why the Romans should have emphasized this feature: in a period when Rome barely could write—the inscription in the Forum, at the end of the regal period, shows what clumsy writing was permitted even on the most official monuments—Etruria, in possession of an alphabet taken from the Greeks and intelligently adapted, would certainly not have been satisfied with writing proper names on the backs of mirrors or on the *cippi* of tombs. But what were these *libri*, in ancient times? If the Etruscans did come from Asia Minor, they certainly may have brought with them, if not copies of those collections of juridical or religious regulations of which the Near East, where men had been scribbling in pictures, cuneiform, or letters for centuries, has left us so many

examples, at least the memory or the idea that the religion of a civilized people should rely upon writings, and prestigious writings. If so, they cannot have stayed very long at Caere, at Tarquinii, or at Clusium without placing their writing at the service of this traditional need. In what form? We do not know.

The *libri* of which the Roman writers translated or paraphrased fragments are of another age, dating from a kind of Etruscan renaissance, but a hopeless renaissance, making as it were its last will and testament. In the final centuries before the Christian era Etruria, firmly attached to Rome, was particularly concerned—a concern sometimes shared by the Romans themselves—to make a contribution to the civilization and life common to the two peoples by compiling whatever of their own traditions might be useful, but also by filling out these traditions and orienting them to suit the needs and tastes of an empire which was on the verge of becoming worldwide. Nothing of this literature has come down to us, but it was the basis for the labors of two or three generations of Roman scholars, on whom everyone who even mentioned the *Etrusca disciplina* relied, down to the Byzantine era, from Cicero to John Lydus.

This Roman endeavor is connected with the great trend of scholarly research which, with Varro and after him, tried to recover antiquities, record customs and rituals, as well as to interpret, justify, and prolong them, with the help of whatever the sciences, pseudo-sciences, and philosophical speculations of Greece and the East could place at the disposal of minds which were more concerned with quantity than with critical evaluation.¹⁷ This is the time in which a Granius Flaccus dedicates his treatise *De indigitamentis* to Caesar, in which a Herennius writes a book (which we should very much like to read) *De sacris Saliaribus Tiburtium*, in which the *De auspiciis* of Messala is added to the *De religionibus* of the jurist Trebatius, and in which Veranius edits, in addition to the *Libri auspiorum*, some *Pontificales quaestiones*, the few surviving fragments of which only make us regret more keenly the loss of the whole. The specialists in Etruscan antiquities are all dependent on these men, who were merely adding to common curiosity the knowledge of a language which certainly very few Romans practiced.

One of the most frequently used of these authors was the Etruscan

17. H. Bardon, *La littérature latine inconnue* 1 (1952): 312-16.

Tarquitiu Priscu, who was very probably a contemporary of Cicero and a native of Tarquinii, the town which is supposed to have been the birthplace of haruspicy. Macrobiu quotes passages of his "translations": from an *Ostentariu Tuscum* and from an *Ostentariu arborariu*. Afterward he was regarded in Etruria as an ornament to the nation; he holds a high place in the *elogia* which Tarquinii engraved, at the start of the Empire, in honor of her great men.¹⁸ No less important was another Etruscan, A. Caecina, the friend of Cicero and a native of Volaterra, a talented orator and on occasion a prophet, who was brought up by his father in the *Etrusca disciplina*. He is largely responsible for the theory of thunderbolts of which Pliny the Elder and Seneca recorded long fragments, unfortunately somewhat confused. Other authors are less well known, and there has been discussion about the identities and dates of some of them: such are a Fonteius and a Capito,¹⁹ who are probably one and the same man, a Vicellius used by Lydus, and an Attalus who was highly regarded by Seneca. To this list we must of course add the unclassifiable P. Nigidius Figulus, Cicero's friend, who was exiled by Caesar. In his brain, crammed with astronomy, physics, and the natural sciences, as well as with theology and ethics, illuminating, blinding, distorting Pythagorean faith was dominant; as the author of works *De extis* and *De diis*, how could he have neglected the Etruscan materials? He is responsible for a "brontoscopic calendar," which has provided useful subject matter for contemporary criticism.²⁰

Our first task is in fact to criticize these sole witnesses, fragmentary though they are, of a knowledge whose original has vanished. How did they work? What kind of "Etruscan thought" do they acquaint us with? What liberties did they take in the organization and the interpretation of the facts, and in the elaboration of the whole? It is not hard to understand the extreme difficulty of such an inquiry, for it

18. J. Heurgon, "Tarquitiu Priscu et l'organisation de l'ordre des haruspices sous l'empereur Claude," *Lat.* 12 (1953): 402-15, with a good discussion of the thesis which makes Tarquitiu a century younger. These first translations of "Etruscan sources" had their imitators at the beginning of the Empire and later; such was Cornelius Labeo, whose date is debated (first or third century), who translated and annotated the corpus of divination in fifteen books, P. de Labriolle, *La réaction païenne* (1934), pp. 297-301.

19. S. Weinstock, "C. Fonteius Capito und die Libri Tagetici," *PBSR* 18 (1950): 44-49.

20. On Nigidius Figulus, see above, p. 550, n. 26.

is not just Caecina or Tarquitiuſ whom we muſt obſerve and weigh, but thoſe who make uſe of them. A Seneca or a Pliny had his own ideas, his own theſes. When ſuch men quote, do they not yield to the inclination which ſo often makes uſ take from a ſentence or a page only that which ſupports our own conceptions? When they combine or try to reconcile ſeveral ſources, to what extent do they alter them? With Lyduſ the riſks are leſſ: he copieſ and compileſ, and he haſ ſcarcelſ any ideaſ of hiſ own; but to compile well requireſ a greater degree of diſcernment than thiſ poor monk waſ equipped with. Even if one refrainſ from the hypercritical attitude which iſ ſo eaſy in theſe matterſ, the net reſult of the diſcuſſionſ of the laſt decadeſ haſ been to diſcredit in large meaſure thiſ whole body of teſtimony. What it giveſ uſ iſ the Etruſcan ſcience of the final period, trimmed with borrowiſgſ which conceal iſ ancient form.

Some legendſ which we have no reaſon to deny to the Etruſcan tradition, whatever may have been the uſe made of them in later timeſ, attributed the compoſition of the religious "ſcriptureſ," the "revelation," aſ it iſ ſometimeſ called, to two perſonſ of long-ago timeſ, a man and a woman, Tageſ and Vegoie (or Begoe, Bigoiſ). Concerniſg Vegoie, the legend iſ ſhort: ſerviuſ, *Aen.* 6.72, qualifieſ her aſ "nympha" and ſayſ that ſhe had written the *arſ fulguriatorum* in the land of the Etruſcanſ. She iſ alſo ſuppoſed to have taught a certain "Arruſnſ Veltimnuſ" ſurveyiſg and the ſkillſ which it requireſ (*Gromatici veteres*, ed. E. Lachmann, 1 [1848]: 350, line 17). On the contrary, marvelous thingſ were known about Tageſ: he waſ born from the furrow, while a man of Tarquinii waſ plowiſg, and had hailed the plowman. At the ſight of thiſ creature, who waſ a child in appearance and a graybeard in wiſdom, the plowman had uttered loud crieſ; all Etruſcia had ſhortly thereafter thronged around the little newcomer, liſtened to hiſ wordſ, and carefully ſet them down in writing. The material which he gave them in thiſ way waſ the *haruſpicinae diſciplinā*. Such iſ Cicero'ſ account (*Diu.* 2.51); Lyduſ (*Oſt.* 3) ſayſ that the Greekſ aſſimilate the "little child" to Chthonian Hermeſ, and giveſ hiſ one "Tarchon" aſ hiſ privileged liſtener; in Feſtuſ (p. 448 L²), Tageſ iſ promoted to *Geni filiſ, nepoſ Jouiſ*, and teacheſ *diſcipulinā haruſpicii* to the twelve peopleſ of Etruſcia. Since the letterſ B and G were foreign to the Etruſcan alphabet, we do not know the native form of the nameſ of Tageſ and of Vegoie-

Begoe; the latter has been compared with a common family name at Clusium, *Vecu-*.

The Etruscan "books" are sometimes called *Tagetici* or *Vegonei*, after these personages, but they are more frequently characterized according to their content. Thus we have to deal with *libri fatales*, *haruspicini*, *fulgurales*, *rituales*, and *acherontici*, but there is no systematic division of subject matter. The only text which combines three of these names with a classificatory intention is *De diuinatione* 1.72: . . . *quod Etruscorum declarant et haruspicini et fulgurales et rituales libri, uestri etiam augurales* . . . It is generally admitted that the *libri acherontici* were part of the *rituales* and that the *fatales* were connected with the latter or with the *haruspicini*; and for the convenience of discussion there is general acceptance of the tripartition in this passage from Cicero. We have nothing better to offer.²¹

LIBRI FULGURALES

For a long time the theory of thunderbolts and the art of the *fulgur(i)-ator* were regarded as the most fully known and the most original part of the *Etrusca disciplina*.²² Two long texts, one by Seneca (*N.Q.* 2.31-41 and 47-51), the other by Pliny (*N.H.* 2.137-46), both relying on Caecina and generally agreeing with each other in their broad outlines, seemed to describe a doctrine which deserved to be called Etruscan, despite analogies in detail, which were very early pointed out, with the Greek *Meteorologica*.²³ There was also the theory of thunders, or rather the catalog of the meanings of thunder depending on the time of year, found in the *De Ostentis* of Lydus, who relied on an unknown author but one evidently belonging to the same school as Caecina.²⁴ In addition, there was the

21. The basic survey of the various "libri" and their contents is still C. O. Thulin's corpus in three parts (cited here: Thulin I, II, III), *Die Etruskische Disziplin*, I, *Die Blitzlehre*, Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift, 11 (1905): i-xv, 1-128; II, *Die Haruspicin*, i bid. 12 (1906): 1-54 (and three plates); III, *Die Ritualbücher und Zur Geschichte und Organisation der Haruspices* ibid. 15 (1909): 1-158. A. Bouché-Leclercq's survey, "Divination étrusque," which forms the first book (pp. 3-115) of the fourth volume of the *Histoire de la divination dans l'Antiquité* (1882), is, like the whole work, a classic which has not been replaced.

22. On the fulgural art, see Bouché-Leclercq, pp. 32-61, and Thulin I.

23. Thulin I, pp. 56-68.

Lyd. *Ost.* 47-52.

brontosopic calendar of Nigidius Figulus, which was also preserved by Lydus.²⁵

Today it is no longer possible to place such easy confidence in these texts. At least opinions vary considerably. For the sake of an example, we shall consider in some detail the last text, the Tonitruale of the Pythagorean Nigidius Figulus. In 1951, almost simultaneously, there appeared two studies, one by A. Piganiol,²⁶ the other by S. Weinstock,²⁷ which dealt with the same facts but reached contrary conclusions on the most important point.

Basing his statements on a famous article by C. Bezold and F. Boll²⁸ and on the recent studies by R. Labat,²⁹ Piganiol first notes that this catalog is constructed like those of Mesopotamia. The meaning of thunder is given for each day of the year, usually in a short sentence; for example, on 15 July, "if it thunders, there will be dissension among the people and a scarcity of wine"; on 16 July, "the king of the East will undergo a war and an illness arising from the dry heat," etc. The calendars from the library of Ashurbanipal and the menologies and hemerologies of Ashur proceed in the same way. More significantly, the landscape and the customs are Eastern; in the country of the calendar, the hot season is feared, the favorable wind blows from the east, grasshoppers are harmful, criminals are impaled, and women intrigue with slaves. "It does not seem rash to say that the Etruscan text is itself the translation of a Chaldean original." But an original applied, as far as politics are concerned, to Etruscan situations.

It is above all a question of powerful men who have kingly ambitions, of princes of the city, of dissensions among the great, of conflicts between those

25. *Ibid.*, 27-38; the months are listed from June to May and they all have thirty days, even February.

26. "Sur le calendrier brontosopique de Nigidius Figulus," *Studies in Roman Economic and Social History in Honor of Allan Chester Johnson* (1951), pp. 79-87. Two years later, the author took up this work again and modified slightly his conclusions, see pp. 340-42 of the article in *Cahiers d'histoire mondiale* cited above (n. 7); it is therefore the 1953 article which will be used here.

27. "Libri fulgurales," *PBSR* 19 (1951): 122-53; the examination of the brontosopic calendar and of the treatise on thunders is on pp. 138-42.

28. "Reflexe astrologischer Kellinschriften bei griechischen Schriftstellern," *SBHAW*, vol. 2, pt. 7 (1911).

29. *Hémérologies et ménologies d'Assur* (1939).

in power and the people. It is almost the picture of the class wars in the heart of Rome during the Ciceronian era. But it is probably an exact picture of the troubles in the heart of the Etruscan cities, and its terms are vague enough to fit even a critical period of the cities of the East. In any case, this vocabulary occurred in other Etruscan books. Servius writes (*Aen.* 2.649): "On the subject of the thunderbolt, we find written in the secret books, *in reconditis*, that if it strikes a prince or a king, *principem ciuitatis uel regem*, and if he survives, his descendants will be illustrious, *nobiles*." Festus (p. 389 L²) speaks of the thunderbolt which foretells an unexpected honor to the *potentes*.

Now in 56, shortly after Cicero's return from exile, among other prodigies there occurred in the *ager Latiniensis* "*strepitus cum fremitu*," a rumbling. The haruspices were sent for. They gave an opinion which is famous in our studies, because Thulin, after subjecting it to a minute analysis, took it as a paradigm of their *responsa*. They designated by name the gods to be appeased, enumerated their grievances, and disclosed the immediate danger. This danger was the following: "It was to be feared," in Piganiol's interpretation, "that after the discord and dissension of the nobles, there would be an increase in murders and dangers for the Fathers and the princes, so that, deprived of support, they would collapse, with the result that the government and the provinces would fall into the hands of a single man, the army would be beaten, and a decline would set in," a *deminutio*—a term, adds Piganiol, which corresponds to an original notation. In the *Tonitruale* of Nigidius, for 25 September, we read: "If it thunders, following dissensions within the state, a tyrant will arise, and he himself will perish, but those in power will undergo unbearable trials." The French historian concludes: "It seems evident that the Roman haruspices consulted, if not the very calendar of Nigidius, at any rate a document which was exactly like it. It is further likely that Cicero's speech on the response of the haruspices dates exactly from September. Thus we can establish a relationship which starts with a Chaldean calendar, passes to an Etruscan book, and from there to the rituals of the Roman haruspices."

This interpretation does not add a great deal to the age of the Etruscan doctrine by causing that doctrine to depend, through a recent borrowing, on Chaldea, since the intermediary agents were probably "those wandering Chaldeans who infested the West in the

second century before our era."³⁰ But it admits, or rather believes it possible to ascertain, that the catalog of Nigidius is a faithful copy of the recent Etruscan model to which the consultation of 56 conformed.

Weinstock likewise surmises that the Etruscan doctrine is dependent on the East, and that it is, somehow, only an adaptation—one of many—of the Chaldean doctrine whose influence was felt universally and lastingly throughout the ancient Mediterranean world. He too surmises that with this reservation the model used by Nigidius has a good claim to be called Etruscan, the haruspices having imitated rather than translated it. But is it really Nigidius's Etruscan model which we read through him? No, Nigidius, in turn, imitated rather than translated; and his imitation was inspired by Roman circumstances. Weinstock does not base his argument on the rubric of 25 September or on the opinion rendered by the haruspices in 56, but retains a few significant examples borrowed from the survey which Kroll made in the *RE*: It is Rome which seems to be designated by the words βασιλις πόλις (p. 65, l. 13 Wachsmuth²) and πόλις (77, 22); discord, civil war, and conspiracies are often predicted, e.g., οἱ ὑπεξούσιοι τῶν εὐγενῶν σκέψονται τι καινὸν ἐν τοῖς κοινοῖς (70, 17), which Kroll translates "principes nobilitatis res novas molientur"; there is frequent reference to a tyrant and to the sufferings endured on his account; there are two passages in which government by a single man is mentioned—εἰς ἓνα τὴν πάντων δύναμιν ἐλθεῖν φράζει· οὗτος δὲ ἔσται τοῖς πράγμασιν ἀθρήσεται (66, 16) and εὐνοία τοῦ δήμου ἀνὴρ τις εἰς ἄκρον εὐδαιμονίας ἀθρήσεται (87, 16)—and these two passages are so different in tone that it is permissible to think in the one case of Caesar and in the other of Pompey. Thus, what we read in Lydus, what Lydus copied from Nigidius Figulus, is merely a brontoscopic calendar "in the style" of the Etruscans, but with a

30. In the 1951 article, p. 86, the author inclined on the contrary toward a very early contact: "I would readily admit that the picture of Etruscan society suggested by the calendar corresponds as well to the disturbances of the fourth century: Etruria at that time was torn by revolutions. But still, what is the likelihood that a calendar of the Chaldean type was reimported from the Orient to Etruria in the fourth century? It seems to me, therefore, that the brontoscopic calendar must be included among the texts which speak in favor of the Eastern origin of the Etruscans. A transmission to the Hellenistic age would doubtless appear to be less likely." This opinion has been rectified, under the influence of Weinstock's "Libri fulgurales," in the 1953 article, p. 348. G. Furlani, in several articles, has tried to minimize Babylonian influence on the fulgural art of Etruria: "Il bidentale etrusco e un'iscrizione di Tiglatpileser I d'Assiria," *SMSR* 6 (1930): 203-31; "Fulmini mesopotamici, hittiti, greci ed etruschi," *SE* 5 (1931): 9-49.

content and with details which were "manipulated," as Weinstock says, by the Roman writer. Therefore it does not reveal an original document, not even a late one. Moreover, Nigidius and Lydus gave fair warning; at the end of the *Tonitruale* we find this sentence: "Nigidius has declared that this daily brontoscopy is not valid everywhere, but concerns only Rome."

Returning to the response made by the haruspices on an unknown date in the year 56, it seems to agree so completely with the circumstances in Rome at this time that we can more readily believe that the haruspices were directly inspired by those circumstances, without having to recite a paragraph from a hemerology. In any case, the rubric of Nigidius Figulus for 25 September is rather more specific than their response at that time; it foretells not only dissensions within the state and the appearance of a tyrant, but also his downfall and, in compensation, severe trials for the men in power. In this final century of the Republic, before the Ides of March, a number of conjunctures coincided with this general scheme. Cicero's confidant and inspirer³¹ was able to think, for example, of the month of September 63, during which Catiline succeeded in bringing to a head the conspiracy which would demonstrate his ambitions, bring about his downfall, and, as a consequence, cause the exile of the former consul.

F. Boll, with Weinstock's approval, likewise revealed Roman "sources," that is, events taken from Roman history which may have had a suggestive influence, in the treatise on thunderbolts, *περὶ κεραυνῶν*, by an unknown author, which Lydus also preserved: p. 106, l. 27 W² (the sun in Pisces), "A young nobleman will wage war against the pirates and will destroy them, and this victory will bring him fame" (this is Pompey, the conqueror of the pirates); 105, 22 (the sun in Scorpio), "If lightning strikes a spot in the public domain, a shameless young man will attempt to seize the throne with the help of criminals and vagabonds" (this is Catiline's conspiracy); 103, 15 (the sun in Gemini), "Two men will compete for the kingship, and the Senate will be divided; soon afterward, each of them will perish, but many men will be in danger because of them" (this is the rivalry of Pompey and Caesar).

These striking agreements suggest that Nigidius and the other

31. Cf. Plut., *An seni gerenda respublica*, end of chap. 27.

learned men adapted rather than translated the Etruscan science. Nobody of that time would have found anything fraudulent in this: at Rome itself, the theory of "good" and "bad" days was enriched by experience, by history, by defeats such as those at the Allia. Was not its capacity for modernization the best proof of its vitality that the *Etrusca disciplina* could give? Cicero knew this very well when, after recounting the birth of Tages and the first revelation of haruspicy, he added (*Diu.* 2.51) that this science *postea creuisse rebus novis cognoscendis et ad eadem illa principia referendis*.

Res nouae cognoscendae is a far-reaching expression. If the history of the last century of the Republic, along with the recipes of the wandering Chaldeans, provided the meaning of certain thunderclaps or of certain bolts of lightning, the general theory of the latter drew for its part on Greek physical science and philosophy, and this time it is Seneca who bears witness, defining his master, Attalus the Stoic, in these terms: *Attalus noster qui Etruscorum disciplinam graeca subtilitate miscuerat* (*N.Q.* 2.50).

Weinstock subjected to a minute and strict examination³² the texts of the *Naturales quaestiones* and the *Naturalis historia*, on which C. O. Thulin based his survey and which, to tell the truth, nothing can replace. Pliny's text is poorly written: it is a collection of carelessly assembled and even somewhat confused jottings, as often happens in the work of this great man. Seneca's is simpler and more elegant. These two texts, with a few scraps from Cicero, Servius, Festus, and Arnobius, form the sum total of our information.

The Etruscans, says Pliny (2.143), divide the sky into sixteen regions—in which Cicero (*Diu.* 2.42) recognizes the result of the two successive bipartitions of the Roman divisions into four. Eight of these regions are situated east of the north-south axis, eight to the west; the former are called *sinistrae* and the latter *dextrae*, from which we can infer an orientation facing southward. The former are regarded as favorable (*quoniam laeua parte mundi ortus*), the others as unfavorable, and the closer they are to the north, the more favorable or unfavorable they are, each in its respective half, probably because the abode of the gods is in the north (*Fest.* p. 428 L², s.v. "*sinistrae aues*": *a deorum sede*).

32. "Libri fulgurales," pp. 124-38.

The "meaning" of a thunderbolt is determined by the portion of the sky from which it comes and by the place where it strikes (*unde uenerint fulmina et quo concesserint*), as well as by the region in which it "rebounds" (*resilire, reuerti*, Sen. N.Q. 2.57.4), for the Etruscans ascribed this property to thunderbolts.

While in the Roman conception only Jupiter (Dius) and Summanus hurl lightning and thunderbolts—Summanus during the night—the Etruscans admit nine gods to this privilege, denoted by the word *manubiae*, which has no etymology and is perhaps transcribed from the Etruscan (Serv. Aen. 1.42). As Jupiter has three kinds of thunderbolt at his disposal, eleven varieties in all are distinguished. Of the eight other divinities who hurl thunderbolts, five are known with certainty: under their Latin names, they are Juno, Minerva,³³ Vulcanus (ibid.), Mars, and Saturnus (Plin. N.H. 2.139);³⁴ we still have no details concerning their behavior.³⁵ On the contrary, the theory of Jupiter has been preserved. It was surely the most important one, and we can understand why Seneca, in his text which parallels Pliny's, speaks only of Jupiter and not of the nine fulgurant gods.

Just as he disposed of three kinds of thunderbolt, Jupiter was the regent of three of the sixteen regions—the first three, according to Martianus Capella (1.45–47) and the commentary of the ps.-Acro on Horace (*Carm.* 1.12.19)—though it is not necessary to believe that he hurled each thunderbolt from one of these three regions, since it is said of one of these *manubiae* (the first?) that he hurled it from wherever he wished, *toto caelo, hoc est de diuersis partibus caeli, scilicet sedecim* (Serv. Aen. 8.427).³⁶ The three thunderbolts are the object of several classifications of definitely diverse origin, among which the compilers have attempted to establish agreements, generally worthless. The

33. Servius II, Aen. 1.42, cannot be adduced as evidence of the Jupiter-Juno-Minerva triad: . . . *antiqui Jouis solius putauerunt esse fulmen, nec id unum esse, ut testantur Etrusci libri de fulguratura, in quibus duodecim genera fulminum scripta sunt, ita ut est Jouis, Junonis, Mineruae, sic quoque aliorum*. The author is evidently alluding to the theory of the nine fulgurant gods, and if he singles out by name only Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva ahead of the "alii," it is because he is writing for a Roman public.

34. Hercules is uncertain: Thulin infers him from several lines in Seneca, *Hercules Oetaeus* 1991–96.

35. Servius, Aen. 11.259, attributes the storms of the vernal equinox to the *manubiae minervales*; Pliny, N.H. 2.139, says: *a Saturni ea sidere proficisci subtilius ista consecrati putant, sicut cremantia a Martis, qualiter cum Volsinii oppidum Tuscorum . . . concrematum est fulmine*.

36. Cf. Mart. Cap. 1.46: Jupiter is *praediatus*, that is, he has a domain, in each of the sixteen regions of the sky.

most interesting of these refers to mythological representations (Sen. 2.41.1-2). The first *manubiae* are benevolent: *monet et placata est et ipsius Jovis consilio mittitur*. This is the *fulmen consiliarium* of which Seneca has spoken a little earlier (39), and which Jupiter uses to *suadere* or to *dissuadere* men who have conceived an undertaking in their minds. On the other hand, the second and third *manubiae* are harmful, either partially or totally. "It is surely Jupiter who sends the second," says Seneca, "but only after he has summoned twelve gods and listened to their advice; it sometimes happens that this thunderbolt does some good, but even then not without having done some harm: its use is always accompanied by some damage." As for the third *manubiae*, Jupiter does not hurl them until he has heard the advice of the gods *quos superiores et inuolutos uocant*. Actually this thunderbolt destroys whatever it strikes, and changes the private or public state of things, "for the fire leaves nothing as it was."

At least in its last term, this picture associates with the mythological classification, based on the nature and the intentions of the gods responsible, another classification which is based on the material results of the happening, and for which Seneca, in the preceding chapter, gives the "scientific" formula: there are three kinds of *fulgur*, *quod terebrat*, *quod discutit*, *quod urit*—the last-named including many subdivisions. Festus (p. 255 L²) introduces a third classification in terms of size: Jupiter's first *manubiae* are *minimae*, the second *maiores*, and the third *ampliores*.³⁷

Despite the abundance of glosses, and also of the historical or pseudo-historical events which exemplified the theory, we are less systematically informed about the other parts of the fulgural art. We know, however, from Seneca (*N.Q.* 2.48.2), who learned it from *Attalus philosophus*, that the specialists diagnosed each case according to the following categories, in which there is nothing unexpected: the place, the time, the receiver, and the circumstances (*ubi factum sit*, *quando*, *cui*, *in qua re*), and the nature and the strength of the thunderbolt (*quale*, *quantum*). We also know that they made a distinction (2.50.1; cf. 51.1) between the thunderbolts whose message concerns

37. Other ternary classifications of thunderbolts: Serv. *Aen.* 8.429: *ostentatorium* (II), *peremptorium* (III), *praesagum* (I); *ibid.* 1, 230, *est fulmen quod terreat* (II), *est quod adflet* (I), *est quod puniat* (III).

man, those which do not presage anything, and those which may have a meaning but which do not concern us or whose interpretation exceeds our capacity (Plin. *N.H.* 2.113 likewise classes the *fulmina* as *fatidica*, *bruta*, and *uana*).³⁸ An entire system of casuistry gave the significance of thunderbolts according to the places, public or private, profane or sacred, which they struck;³⁹ also according to their connection with the stage of progress of a human undertaking (before, after; having no connection);⁴⁰ and according to the extent in time of the warning or the threat which they made known, *perpetua*, *finita* (in force for only a limited space of time), and *prorogatiua*. This last variety introduces an idea which seems to have been important in all relations of man with the gods, the idea of respite or reprieve: those *fulmina* are *prorogatiua* whose threat can be not canceled but postponed, with the postponement not exceeding ten years in private matters or thirty years in public matters.

This whole science ended up in practical formulas, intended to purify the place, the thing, or the creature struck by lightning, and also to appease, if possible, the divinity who hurled it and who could be identified, thanks to the oriented map of the sixteen celestial regions. The purification of the ground consisted of hiding the marks of the accident by burying them (*condere fulmen*) and the sacrifice of sheep (*oue expiare*); the place, which the Romans regarded as *religiosus* and which was not to be walked on, was called a *puteal* "lightning-well," or *bidental*⁴¹—a name which the ancients generally explained as *locus . . . ubi immolabantur oues quae duos dentes habent praecisores* (ps.-Acro in Hor. *ad Pis.* 471), but in which Herrmann Usener claimed, not without probability, to recognize the image of a lightning-harpoon, rivaling the Greek trident.⁴² Special prescriptions provided for the blasting of various kinds of trees (Plin. *N.H.* 15.57; 17.124; Varr. *R.R.* 1.40.5). Another part of this delicate art placed the thunderbolt in the service of man, through the theory of visiting thunderbolts (*hospitalia*) and helping thunderbolts (*auxiliaria*). Seneca mentions them (*N.Q.* 2.49.3), as well as Pliny; according to the

38. Thulin I, p. 69.

39. *Ibid.*, pp. 78–80.

40. *Ibid.*, p. 81.

41. Thulin tried to distinguish between *puteal* and *bidental*; our information is too scanty for such discussions.

42. "Keraunos," *RhM* 60 (1905): 22.

latter (*N.H.* 2.140), certain sacrifices and certain prayers could either compel (mechanically) or obtain (from the gods) the lightning (*uel cogi, uel impetrari*), and he cites as a properly Etruscan example a tradition of Volsinii: the king "Porsina" had obtained in this way the blasting of a monster which was ravaging the town's lands. As for the *fulmina hospitalia*, it was Jupiter himself who came as a guest under the guise of the celestial fire, not without bringing great risks, of which the tragic death of Tullus Hostilius is Rome's most famous example.

The critical examination of these data, begun by Thulin, was vigorously pursued by Weinstock. To be sure, not all the connections which have been suggested with the doctrines and the techniques of the Greeks or of the Near East recommend themselves with equal force, but it is beyond doubt that we have here a late "science," the authors of which have drawn on all the sources of the Hellenistic age, from the *Meteorologica* attributed to Aristotle to the humbugs of the expatriated Chaldeans. Under its manifold accretions, the ancient core of this science is hard to determine. Even the data which seem at first to be the most original have found themselves assigned a plausible source. Thulin explained the eleven kinds of thunderbolt⁴³ by an old Babylonian zodiac with eleven signs, in which Scorpio contained that which later became Libra, and which was also known to Greece and Magna Graecia, judging from Plato's *Phaedrus* (246e), from a disk of Tarentum dating from the fourth century, and from several astronomers. Did the Etruscan scholars borrow directly from the Babylonians, or through the medium of the Greeks? In either case, it was a borrowing.⁴⁴ The "scientific" classifications of Jupiter's three thunderbolts according to their effects (*quod terebrat, quod discutit, quod urit*, etc.) are derived from Greek meteorology, which presents several variant versions of them.

Are the twelve gods described as *Consentes* (or *Complices*), who assist Jupiter when there is an occasion for hurling the second kind of thunderbolt, themselves based on an old Etruscan conception? They were a source of embarrassment to the Roman scholars, who assimilated them, sometimes in terms better suited to the *Superiores*

43. A variant with twelve thunderbolts in *Serv. Aen.* 1.42.

44. Bibliography in Weinstock, "Libri fulgurales," p. 126, nn. 13, 14, 15.

gods, to the Etruscan "Penates," another obscure conception. In any case, if they are ancient, they were adapted to conform to the taste of the times. Arnobius (3.40), following Varro, says that they owe their name to the fact "that they rise and go to bed together, six males and six females." These expressions point toward a system of zodiacal signs, but with twelve elements, and recall the Egyptian doctrine which assigns to the four elements twice four divine patrons, some male, the others female;⁴⁵ the Greeks too—Eudoxus and Plato—seem to have identified the signs of the twelve months with an old conception of theirs, the δώδεκα θεοί, who had received a cult at Athens since the end of the sixth century and who made their solemn entry into the Roman pantheon at the time of the lectisternium of 217.⁴⁶ As for the conception of gods who counsel a great god, it too has parallels, such as the βουλαῖοι θεοί of the Chaldeans and the Egyptians—the latter being precisely the twelve gods of the zodiac.

The situation is the same for almost all the details of Pliny's and Seneca's texts,⁴⁷ even for the sixteen regions, which were produced by two successive dichotomies of the Chaldean (and Roman) division of the sky into quadrants.⁴⁸ Only with the gods called *Superiores* and *Inuoluti* do we have the impression of touching a properly Etruscan mythology of fate. We know nothing about them, however, save perhaps, if they must be assimilated to the Penates,⁴⁹ that their number and names are unknown and that they dwell in the *penetralia* of the sky.

Therefore we must subscribe to the considerations with which Weinstock introduces his demonstration:

45. Ibid., p. 127, nn. 17, 18, 19.

46. Ibid., p. 128, n. 20; above, pp. 476–77.

47. Weinstock, "Libri fulgurales," p. 129, sums up his investigation in three points: The doctrine of the *manubiae* thus consists of (i) Etruscan elements, represented by Jupiter and his two divine councils; (ii) Greek scientific classifications; and (iii) the belief in the sidereal origin of the lightnings—this last element, which rests on popular belief, being well represented in Greece and Mesopotamia.

48. Weinstock, in an appendix to his article "Martianus Capella and the Cosmic System of the Etruscans," *JRS* 36 (1946): 127, n. B, gives a list of Greek and Roman cases in which the division into sixteen is found, without being applied to divination: the second part of this article, pp. 116–26, is devoted to the sixteen regions and their relation to the *octatropos* of Greek astrology (which had already been recognized by Bouché-Leclercq, *L'astrologie grecque* [1899], p. 279).

49. The text of Arnobius, *Gent.* 3.40, made up of information taken from various authors, is hard to interpret: *nec eorum numerum . . . sciri; sex mares et totidem feminas*; the first indication must refer to the *Superiores*, the second to the *Consentes*, confused with the *Penates* in one and the same assimilation.

In early centuries, when called to Rome to explain some portents, they [the *haruspices*] were not required to justify their findings. But in hellenised Rome no Roman and no stranger could discuss the heavenly signs in ignorance of, say, Aristotelean meteorology, of the Stoic-Epicurean debates about divination and determinism, and so on. The *haruspices* could easily satisfy such demands because their country was not less hellenised than Rome and because they always aimed to be up to date. So too the Etruscan writers of the first century B.C. were men of considerable learning, equals in their subjects to Cicero and Varro. A fundamental difference, however, divided the *haruspices* and their theorists from the Romans: whereas the Greek spirit made the Romans receptive to a secular culture for its own sake, it influenced the Etruscans only so far as it helped them to improve and modernise their sacred books; and because the Greeks, for good reasons, could not satisfy them fully they turned to the writings of hellenised Orientals.⁵⁰

Under this thick and motley cloak, does the theory of thunderbolts at least allow us to glimpse a few features characteristic of Etruscan "religiosity"? Even this is not likely. Scholars usually remind us of Seneca's sentence contrasting the scientific positivism of the Greeks with the mystical finalism of the Etruscans (N.Q. 32.2): "*Hoc inter nos [philosophos] et Tuscos interest: nos putamus, quia nubes conlisae sunt, fulmina emitti, ipsi existimant nubes conlidi ut fulmina emittantur; nam cum ad deum referant, in ea opinione sunt, tanquam non, quia facta sunt, significant, sed quia significatura sunt, fiant.*" But the opposition which Seneca stresses is not between Greek science and Etruscan religion, it is between all science and all religion. The expression *cum omnia ad deum referant* might be applied to any fulgural doctrine, and if the Etruscan doctrine is spotlighted here, it is merely because Seneca derives his information from the Etruscan Caecina's Latin work; if he had had the writings of the Chaldeans in his library, he would have said the same thing about them.

In the theory of Jupiter's thunderbolts, and in the formidable staffs of advisers who assist him with the second, and especially with the third, many scholars think they are confronted with one of the expressions of that absolute, demoralizing fatalism which has been called a characteristic of the Etruscans: Etruscan man would have been overwhelmed and crushed by the action of the gods, the most powerful of whom were systematically malevolent. However, this fatalism is not apparent in certain important elements of the dossier. The

50. "Libri fulgurales," p. 123.

differentiation of the *fulmina* as *fatidica*, *bruta*, and *uana* must have given the Etruscan practitioners a freedom of choice which was to be sure smaller than that of the augur who refused to look and claimed that he had not seen, but which was appreciable. The theory of the *fulmina hospitalia* and *auxiliaria* even gave men a power which the Romans did not claim for themselves: the kings of legend, the clever Numa and the clumsy Tullus, had no heirs in history. Finally, the idea of a benevolent thunderbolt, *bonum fulmen*, probably the commonest of Jupiter's three varieties, which is not without parallels in both Greece and Rome, shows, under the disturbing *Consentes* and the terrible *Superiores*, a very powerful god who is, or may be, the ally of men.⁵¹

LIBRI HARUSPICINI

Like the art of interpreting and conjuring the thunderbolts, haruspicy, or the art of reading the information written in the entrails of victims, was in the eyes of the Romans a specialty of the Etruscans.⁵² To them it even seemed so characteristic that Cicero does not hesitate to call the entire discipline by this name:⁵³ the obscurity of the first element of the Latin word *haru-spex*⁵⁴ favored these extensions. But the same Cicero, on another page of the same book, correctly reduces *haruspex* to its limited meaning of *extispex*, observer of entrails, as opposed to *fulgurator* and *interpres ostentorum*. Still, we must not conclude from this imperialism of the word, as has been done, that the inspection of entrails was "der ursprünglichste und wesentlichste Bestandteil der etruskischen Divination."

In any case, it was a question of an art foreign to Roman religion proper. To be sure, the internal as well as the external soundness of the victim, and its fulfillment of the requisite conditions for the

51. On the Etruscan name of the *fulgur(i)ator* and on the meaning of this word ("he who interprets the thunderbolt," "he who calls forth the thunderbolt"?), see the comments and the bibliography in R. Bloch, *Les prodiges dans l'antiquité classique* (1963), p. 150, n. 2.

52. Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire de la divination* 4: 61-74; Thulin II; G. Blecher, *De extispicio capita tria*, RGV 2 (1905).

53. *Div.* 2.49: *sed quoniam de extis et de fulgoribus satis est disputatum, ostenta restant, ut tota haruspicina sit pertrectata.*

54. See the dictionaries by Ernout-Meillet and Walde-Hofmann; there is no certain etymology.

sacrifice of an animal, involved an examination, at Rome as in India, which was called a *probatio* and which ended in the favorable cases with the *litatio*. In the beginning, however, this examination was only for purposes of verification: an abnormal liver merely disqualified the victim and made necessary the presentation of another. In contrast, the Etruscan examination really begins after the *probatio*, and involves consultation and exploration:⁵⁵ whether normal or abnormal, the entrails, in their diversity, are like a book which must be deciphered, section by section. And this is particularly true of the liver, whose shape and topography along clear-cut lines make it suitable for this practice.

In fact, one principle supported haruspicy and seems moreover to have governed the whole essentially classificatory religious thought of the Etruscans: the principle of homology, point by point, between the various structured wholes which form the universe. Just as the totality of the gods is distributed over the totality of the celestial regions, so this latter totality, with its divine inhabitants, is reflected in the third totality formed by the parts of the liver of the sacrificed sheep: from the organic condition of each of these parts a conclusion may be drawn regarding the mystical condition of the corresponding region and the inclinations of the divinity or divinities who rule it. An entirely external but significant consequence is that the Roman sacrificer observes the organs as they are in the body, *adhaerentia exta*, while the haruspex is technically obliged to extract them; another consequence, after the Etruscan practice had overrun Rome, was the distinction between *hostiae consultatoriae*, used for divination, and *hostiae animales*, mere offerings of a "soul," a life, to the intended god.

In 1877, in a field in the commune of Grossolengo, in the southwestern approaches to Piacenza, a discovery was made, many of which we should like to have available for our research: the object unearthed was a reproduction of a sheep's liver, in bronze, covered with lines and the names of divinities.⁵⁶ Evidently it was intended as

55. See above, p. 606.

56. Frequently reproduced, notably by Thulin II, pl. I. J. Heurgon, on pp. 183-85 of "Note sur la lettre A dans les inscriptions étrusques," *Studi in onore di Luisa Banti* (1965), thinks that the liver found at Piacenza was made in the neighborhood of Cortona, which he gives reasons for regarding as the place where Etruscan religion was kept alive. He believes that the object "fell out of the baggage of a haruspex during a move in the vicinity of this

a model, a guide for the investigation of livers, and the entire doctrine of the haruspices is presented on it in condensed form. There can be no doubt about the principle: it is indeed the macrocosm which is reproduced in miniature, in various ways, on the two faces of the organ. The age of the liver of Piacenza is still under discussion; the most likely estimate (Körte) dates it from the third or second century B.C., at the time of the "Etruscan renaissance" considered above, but there is a possibility that it is more recent (Deecke: the end of the Republic).

The symbolism of the convex face is simple. It is divided by a line in relief, between the two lobes (*fibrae*). On each of these two areas a single word is inscribed, *usils* on the right, *tivr* on the left, which are generally agreed to be the names of the sun and the moon. Thus it must be thought that each of the lobes corresponded to a half of space or of time and that these two halves were regarded respectively as solar and luminous, and lunar and nocturnal. It is probable, though not demonstrable, that this structure coincides with the one which governs the fulgural art and in which the sixteen regions of the sky are divided into two halves, on either side of the north-south axis, the "left" side (toward the east) being favorable and the "right" side unfavorable. Does it also correspond to the division of the liver into *pars familiaris* and *pars hostilis (inimica)*, of which Cicero speaks (*Diu.* 2.28; cf. *Liv.* 8.9.1; *Luc. Phars.* 1.621)? Such is the general opinion. But we do not know what kind of *responsa* was drawn from the summary division of this face.

The concave face is much more elaborate. It bears forty names of gods, most of them inscribed in closed compartments. First of all, the entire periphery is divided into sixteen compartments, end to end, which form a continuous border. The number sixteen is certainly not fortuitous: these little irregular rectangles are the projection of the sixteen regions of the sky. Apart from the border, two differing structures overlay the lobes; the greater part, and the outermost, of the left lobe is divided into six irregular connected trapezia forming a wheel; the remainder, the part closest to the constriction which

center of communications, perhaps one of those haruspices who were attached to the staff of a general in the field, or of a provincial governor," and the writer goes so far as to imagine that "the careless haruspex" may well have been the famous Spurinna, Caesar's haruspex (*Suet. Caes.* 81.9; etc.).


corresponds to the *suspensorium hepatis*, contains two names unenclosed by any line (eight names altogether). The right lobe and the gall bladder, which juts out of it, are fairly regularly marked off in grids, and bear within the rectangles of these grids thirteen names, to which are added three incompletely enclosed names (sixteen names altogether). This opposition of the *wheel* on the left and the *grid* on the right surely had a meaning, but we cannot fathom it; in its principle, it recalls the Indo-European opposition of *round* and *square* which has been studied above in connection with the Roman doctrine of the sacred fires and which can be summed up in its Vedic formulation as follows: the round is the present world, the square is the celestial world.⁵⁷

Two uncertainties render aleatory any attempt to make a detailed interpretation of the concave face: the writing of many names is abbreviated, reduced to the initial letters; the orientation of the liver, and the line which should represent the north-south direction on it are contested.

The conclusions which can be drawn from the divine names inscribed on the liver will be examined later. As for the orientation, the likeliest and most natural is the one proposed by A. Grenier:⁵⁸ the partly drawn line which joins the two indentations of the border on either side of the *papillary process* is the north-south axis, the north being the side where this elevation is closest to the border. If such is the case, the numbering of the compartments along the border would begin and end immediately above the *papillary process*, with compartments 1 (toward the east) and 16 (toward the west) adjoining. The east (favorable) would then be that part of the border included in the right lobe, and the west (unfavorable) that in the left lobe. But these connotations are probably valid only for the border, with the interior parts of the wheel and the grid having a different symbolism. The position of "Jupiter" seems to favor this interpretation. He does not occupy compartment 1 (marked *Cilensl*), but he is present in compartments 2 (*Tin(ia) Cilen*) and 3 (*Tin(ia) Θvf*); moreover,

57. See above, pp. 313-17.

58. "L'orientation du foie de Plaisance," *Lat.* 5 (1946): 293-98. But it is not certain. Deecke, followed by Thulin, set the starting point (and the north) between Grenier's compartments 3 and 4; Pallottino sets it between 1 and 2: "Deorum sedes," *Studi in onore di A. Calderini e R. Paribeni* 3 (1956): 223-34. Each of these systems allows one to account for certain details which are unexplained in the others.



THE PIACENZA LIVER

- a*, gall bladder
b, caudate process
c, papillary process

Border

- | | |
|-------------|-------------|
| 1 Cilensl | 9 Caθ |
| 2 Tin Cilen | 10 Fuffluns |
| 3 Tin θvf | 11 Selva |
| 4 Ani θne | 12 Leθns |
| 5 Uni Mae | 13 Thluscv |
| 6 Tecvm | 14 Cel |
| 7 Leθn | 15 Cvlaip |
| 8 Eθ | 16 Vetisl |

*Right Lobe**In the grid pattern:*

- | | |
|--------------|------------|
| 17 Tinsθ Neθ | 21 Ne |
| 18 θuflθas | 22 Lasl |
| 19 Tins θvf | 23 Fufflus |
| 20 Leθn | 24 Caθa |

Around the gall bladder:

- | | |
|---------------|---------|
| 25 Mar Thlusc | 27 Herc |
| 26 Mari | |

On the gall bladder:

- | | |
|---------|---------------|
| 28 θ | 31 Marisl Laθ |
| 29 N | 32 Tv θ |
| 30 Leta | |

*Left Lobe**Outside the wheel pattern:*

- | | |
|-----------|------------|
| 33 Letham | 34 θetlumθ |
|-----------|------------|

In the wheel pattern:

- | | |
|-----------|-------------|
| 35 Cilcen | 38 Thlusc |
| 36 Selva | 39 Lysl Vel |
| 37 Leθms | 40 Satres |

compartment 16 is marked *Vetisl*: if, as is supposed, this name (with the genitive in *l*) is a transcription of the name of the infernal (?) Jupiter of the Latins (*Vedius*), then "Jupiter" would appear in three compartments, the two best (after 1) and the worst (just as he is present in the three regions of the sky, but the first three, according to Martianus Capella), compartment 1 being reserved, under the name *Cilen-*, for those mysterious gods, *Superiores et Inuoluti* or Penates,⁵⁹ who seem to form a kind of council of fate more powerful than Jupiter himself. But this is purely hypothetical. It is notable, and disturbing, that in none of his four mentions (two on the border, two on the right lobe: *Tinsθ Neθ*, *Tins θvf*) does the name *Tinia* occur alone, as we might expect the name of the supreme god to do.

The discovery of the liver of Piacenza has given consistency and precision to research in comparative hepatomancy. As early as 1906, C. O. Thulin compared it with the terra-cotta models which were used for the same purposes in Mesopotamia, especially with two examples, covered with inscriptions, in the British Museum.⁶⁰ Subsequently the instruments of comparison were multiplied. In particular, the conception of Assyro-Babylonian haruspicy which had been formed at the beginning of the century was corrected and sharpened by the work of R. Labat and J. Nougayrol,⁶¹ while, on the other hand, the deciphering of Hittite gave access to a new field. What are the results today of this prolonged effort?

Actually connections of kinship seem probable, but cannot be proved, since the analogies proposed remain general. For example, the Mesopotamian livers which Thulin used and which are still among the best documents,⁶² do not show the essential feature of the liver of Piacenza, namely, the obvious correspondence between the cosmos and the surface of the model. They have no border, no op-

59. This is Thulin's interpretation, *Die Götter des Martianus Capella und der Bronzeleber von Piacenza*, R V V 3, 1 (1906): 36.

60. Thulin II, pp. 29-37, etc., and pls. II and III.

61. Most recently, see the publication of the fourteenth international Assyriological conference, *La divination en Mésopotamie ancienne et dans les régions voisines* (1967).

62. These are not the oldest: M. Rutten, "Trente-deux modèles de foie en argile provenant de Tell-Hariri (Mari)," *Revue d'Assyriologie* 35 (1938): 36-51, pls. I-XVIII; Grenier, in *Mana* 2, 3 (1948): 30, says of them: "These livers covered with inscriptions antedate the destruction of Mari by Hammurabi, to whose precise time the earliest known examples used to be ascribed."

position between wheel and grid. Nowhere does one see a simple divine name in the compartments: what is written on the various parts of the organ consists of short sentences announcing a specific action by a god, or even an event which is not covered by any divine name.⁶³ The few similarities of detail which some have claimed to recognize between the localizations, on the surface, of an Etruscan god and a Babylonian prophecy relating to the supposed province of this god, are extremely uncertain.⁶⁴ Thus, following A. Boissier, Thulin noted⁶⁵ that on the Chaldean liver which he was studying the gall bladder bore five lines of inscription, the fourth of which seemed to mean "and rain in [the country] of the enemy (?)" ; now, according to Pliny (*N.H.* 11.195), the haruspices attributed the gall bladder to "Neptunus," and the one on the liver of Piacenza also has five inscribed divisions, the second of which bears the letter N, which may be regarded as the initial of Neptunus . . . The most interesting of the proposed parallels is the following, translated here from J. Nougayrol's report:

The tutelary gods of Assyrian haruspicy are Shamash (the sun god) and Adad (god of the storm). Shamash goes on his own: as he reads the tablets through their coverings, he inscribes his message in the very belly of the lamb. But the presence of Adad, the supreme god of the mountainous regions

63. J. Nougayrol, "Haruspicine étrusque et assyro-babylonienne," *CRAI*, 1955, pp. 509-17 (followed by a rather feeble discussion at the Academy), nevertheless writes (p. 514): "The library at Nineveh offers us a small group of documents in which, for each sign marked out on the liver, there is a corresponding medical diagnosis which assigns responsibility to a particular god (cf. A. Boissier, *Documents assyriens*, pp. 209 ff., and the unpublished duplicates in the British Museum: K 2896, K 3988). On the other hand, in the very beginning of Babylonian haruspicy, we have believed that we could discover, according to the type of the dominant nomenclature, the traces of an earlier phase of this art, in which the various kinds of presages (agricultural, political, military, etc.) each occupied its own hepatic zone; this would likewise bring us closer to the qualitative selectivity of the Etruscan liver. Thus either this liver brings us the echo of a remote tradition, from which the *bārû* [Babylonian soothsayer] may also have borrowed, or else—and this is the likeliest alternative—it merely reflects a later effort, one of many, aimed at integrating divination with religion, at placing the old magical mechanism of the sign-presage in the hands of the gods." See also now Nougayrol, "Le foie d'orientation *British Museum* 50494," *Revue d'Assyriologie* 62 (1968): 31-50.

64. See the important memoir, which eliminates various flimsy hypotheses, by G. Furlani, "Epatoscopia babilonese et epatoscopia etrusca," *SMSR* 4 (1928): 243-85; p. 243. n. 1, bibliography on Babylonian hepatoscopy; p. 265, the author believes that hepatoscopy may have "polygenetic origins"; he concludes: "Però possiamo affermare fondatamente che i rapporti tra le due epatoscopie non dimostrano affatto la provenienza degli Etruschi dall' Asia Minore."

65. Thulin II, pp. 20-21.

of the north, Assyria, Urartu, Hurri, Hatti, and northern Syria, under various names which do not conceal his fundamental identity, can only be justified if, at a certain period, the soothsayers of Mesopotamia, like those of Etruria, associated extispicy which came from Babylonia (Sippar, Larsa) with the doubtless more flourishing brontoscropy and keraunoscopy on the high periphery of the Fertile Crescent.⁶⁶

But even this does not prove anything: it is natural for peoples to whom divination is important to establish ties between the various techniques of the soothsayers and the mythical foundations of these techniques.

Those who do not despair of reading in the known Etruscan facts of the last centuries before our era doctrines brought to Italy seven or eight hundred years earlier by the emigrants from Asia Minor hoped to learn a great deal from Hittite haruspicy, which is represented by abundant documents: were we not going to discover in it the immediate source, or the closest relative, of the haruspicy of the Tyrrhenians? After the initial enthusiasm, it was necessary to recognize a leading fact:⁶⁷ Hittite haruspicy, to the extent that it stems from Babylonian, was first recast by the Hurrians, to whom the Hittites owed so much, and these Hurrians imposed upon it, along with a new vocabulary, profound alterations (for example, in connection with the gall bladder). E. Laroche, at the end of an article which cannot be too thoroughly pondered,⁶⁸ has concluded:

The hypothesis of a transmission of haruspicy to the occidental peoples (Lydians, Etrusco-Romans) by the Hittites is couched in more complicated terms than is ordinarily imagined (A. Boissier, G. Contenau, A. Grenier). If we acknowledge a closer kinship between the Babylonian and the Etruscan soothsaying than between the Babylonian and the Hittite, then the problem of Etruscan haruspicy cannot be solved by the theory of an Anatolian origin.⁶⁹

66. "Haruspicine étrusque et assyro-babylonienne," p. 510.

67. See the criticism by G. Furlani, *SE* 10 (1936): 153-62, of A. Boissier, *Mantique babylonienne et mantique hittite* (1935); on p. 159, Furlani rejects (following R. Pettazzoni, "Elementi extra-italici nella divinazione etrusca," *SE* 1 [1927]: 199) the hypothesis of "Anatolian missionaries in Italy" (Boissier, pp. 10-11); cf. "Mantica babilonesa ed etrusca," *Tyrrhenica, saggi di studi etruschi* (1957), pp. 61-76. In Pettazzoni's article, see p. 196, the bibliography on extispicy among the American Indians.

68. "Éléments d'haruspicine hittite," *Revue hittite et asianique*, 12 (fasc. 54) (1952): 19-48.

69. Cf. Furlani, *SE* 10 (1936): 161, n. 1: "Se i fegati hittiti fossero stati gli intermediari tra quelli babilonesi e quelli degli Etruschi, dovrebbero dimostrare maggiori somiglianze col fegato di Piacenza dei primi. Invece questo non è punto il caso."

The study of the matter is at this stage: Etruria does not present an extension of an Anatolian province of Mesopotamian haruspicy, and the analogies which can be observed between Etruria and Mesopotamia have to be explained by later influences and later borrowings. Of what period? In principle, all the periods that one might suggest are plausible:

Assyro-Babylonian haruspicy [writes Nougayrol] is a continuous tradition which is revealed to us, already "fully armed," on the verge of the second millennium B.C., and which follows its course, augmented by all kinds of subtle commentaries or critical apparatuses, down to the eve of our own era. The finest "hepatoscopic" tablets of the Louvre date from the ninetieth to the hundredth year of the Seleucid epoch. . . . Rough models and anatomical sketches from the Sargonid period have likewise come down to us. If archaeology has furnished us with fewer of them for this period than for the Hammurabian or post-Amarnian times, it can only be an accident. In other words, the Etruscan models, wherever one locates them, will always find contemporaries in the East.⁷⁰

It was probably at a relatively late period that Etruria, like Greece, became acquainted with the details of these doctrines, and the Greek intermediary is not to be excluded. Nougayrol reminds us⁷¹ that a good part of the hepatoscopic nomenclature contained in Hesychius is a literal translation of figurative expressions employed by the Babylonians ("road," "obstacle," "river," "great door," etc.).

It is further possible that Etruria derived its hepatoscopic conceptions or techniques from several sources, or, if you will, that it was dependent on Mesopotamia through several channels. The liver of Piacenza is the most spectacular model, but not the only one left to us by the Etruscan soothsayers.⁷² Others exist of an entirely different type. Nougayrol directs attention to a liver of Falerii Veteres, preserved in the Villa Giulia and probably dating from the third century B.C. This "humble clay model" does not carry the wealth of illustration of the bronze model, but it is the very moderation of its indications that is significant. In addition to the three projections which inevitably appear on every reproduction of a liver—gall bladder, papillary process, and caudate process—there is no marking save for

70. "Haruspicine étrusque et assyro-babylonienne," pp. 510-11.

71. *Ibid.*, p. 512.

72. There is also the alabaster liver of Volterra, though it is not very instructive, reproduced in Blecher, *De extispicio*, pl. III, fig. 2.

two perpendicular strokes in the center of the left lobe. "Every Assyriologist having some acquaintance with the *bârûtu* will recognize these and name them immediately: they are the *manziṣu* '(divine) presence' and the *padanu* 'road,' the *θεός* and the *κλέυθος* of Hesychius, fundamental elements in the hepatoscopic picture. In fact they held considerable ominous importance for the Babylonian soothsayers and their imitators. It is sufficient to recall that the absence of the former signified the absence of the god, or in other words, that without it any liver was worthless." On the highly schematic liver of Falerii Veteres, these two furrows, the only ones to be drawn, cannot have been made out of mere concern for anatomical exactitude: serving as determinants for the soothsayer, they are, for the anatomist or the modeler, only two meaningless wrinkles. "Our veterinaries pay no attention whatever to them, and no uninformed mind would distinguish these ephemeral traces of the pressure of the organs from those which surround them." The liver of Falerii, which was certainly not imported and which is of Etruscan make (the pyramidal shape of the caudate process is enough to guarantee this), thus demonstrates that "in the examination of the liver, the haruspex followed exactly the very particular principles of anatomical analysis peculiar to the *bârû*."

But even better: the observation of this model suggests a new avenue of influence:

By what route [says Nougayrol] did the fundamental tradition which it illustrated travel from Babylon to the outskirts of Rome? Perhaps the answer is suggested by a detail. The two livers of Megiddo, a center of international culture in Palestine, bear the five elements which also appear on the liver of Falerii (and only those), and they portray the *lobus caudatus*, not as it is in reality and as it appears on most of the Mesopotamian and Hittite livers [in the shape of a bent "finger"], but in the geometric shape of a pyramid, just as at Falerii or Piacenza, while their rectangular drawing of the left lobe is probably inspired by a known Babylonian prototype. If this shared geometrical portrayal of the "finger" is not mere coincidence, perhaps we should look in Phoenicia for the center of this westward-moving practice which, more than any other, left its profound impress on Etruscan culture.⁷³

73. "Haruspicine étrusque et assyro-babylonienne," p. 517; Nougayrol recalls in a note that on an early Babylonian liver in the British Museum the *lobus caudatus* is treated schematically, as a pyramid. In a related direction, see A. Hus, "Quelques cas de rapports directs entre Etrurie, Cappadoce et Syrie du nord vers 600 av. J. C.," *MEFR* 71 (1959): 7-42.

In the present state of our knowledge, we cannot afford to overlook these discreetly worded hypotheses. Nor should we forget the fact, mentioned earlier by Thulin, that the opposition of a *pars familiaris* and a *pars hostilis* is implied in a scholium on the *Prometheus Vincitus* of Aeschylus, line 484: the bile, extravasted and projected "toward the side of the foes," foretells their defeat.⁷⁴ Finally, we must not lose sight of the fact that, like the theory of thunderbolts, the divine topography of the liver of Piacenza allows a great deal of space for the divinities whom the Etruscans borrowed from the Italic peoples: in addition to *Vetis-l*, mentioned above, these are *Ani* (Janus), *Uni* (Juno), *Maris-l*, *Selva(ns)*, *Neθ(uns)*, and perhaps *Vel(χans)*, to whom *Herc(le)* is to be added. Thus the theological system associated with the hepatoscopic technique is a composite one, and is not dependent on the Near East.

The haruspicy of Etruria was not confined, any more than that of Babylonia, to an examination of the glossy surface of the liver: the veins, the folds, the *caput iecinoris* "head of the liver" (probably the *caudate process* of the anatomists),⁷⁵ all had their codes for deciphering, of which very little has survived to our day. The liver itself was only the choicest item in a considerable assortment of organs.⁷⁶ To judge from what became of the Etruscan art of haruspicy among the Romans, the heart, the lungs, and the spleen also furnished signs.

Moreover, a few Roman expressions suggest that the *haruspex*, like the *fulgur(i)ator*, did not lack loopholes: just as the *fulgura* declared to be *bruta* or *uana* were adjudged to have no significance or not to concern mankind, so the expert could declare the entrails to be "mute": *muta exta appellabant, ex quibus nil diuinationis animaduvertebant* (Paul. p. 274 L²).⁷⁷ We do not know by what criteria, or consequently with what measure of freedom, this verdict was rendered. The parallelism with the thunderbolts extends to the *exta adiutoria* which warn against impending danger, fire, poison, etc. (*ibid.*). Thus these beneficent entrails play the same role as the *fulgura monitoria*, the "good" thunderbolts of Jupiter.

74. Thulin II, p. 29.

75. *Ibid.*, pp. 30-33, 45.

76. *Ibid.*, pp. 22-23, 44-45.

77. *Ibid.*, pp. 46-47.

The indigenous name of the *haruspices* has not been definitely established.⁷⁸ But we can glimpse certain characteristics of their priesthood which was so important in public and private life. The most apparent of these is the fact that the priests were recruited from the upper classes of society,⁷⁹ and this helps us to understand how so many strange "intellectual" elements could be constantly blended into the main body of the doctrine. Politically, in Rome itself, we see them favoring the *optimates* in their verdicts, the vocabulary and tone of which are noticeably "noble." This orientation is seen throughout Etruscan soothsaying. For example, in the calendar of Nigidius Figulus only danger threatening men of rank are mentioned: thus, in the first two months alone, those who hold power in the boroughs and small towns (5 June), a very powerful man (13 June), a very rich man (16 June), the *principes* of the republic (27 June), a good *princeps* (5 July), a great *princeps* (17 July), powerful men (19 July), and a powerful man (24 July); and the "dissensions" of the people to which frequent allusions are made are apparently regarded as the chronic ailment of an aristocratic republic. To be sure, we may believe that these are commonplaces, that they are "personages" as much to be expected in the consultations of those times as the blond lady or the rich gentleman in the predictions of our own fortune-tellers. But it is not immaterial that the commonplaces and the expected personages should have been precisely these.

LIBRI RITUALES

The subject matter of the *libri rituales* went beyond what was proclaimed by their title:⁸⁰ along with religious rites, they treated every-

78. Somewhat optimistically, in *Etruscologia*, at the end of the chapter on religion, Pallottino gives a vocabulary of the priesthoods: *cepen θaurχ* "a funeral priest"; various priests: *eisnev* (connected with *aisna* "the sacrificial act"), *celu*, *ceχasie*, and perhaps *tamera*, *santi*; *netšvis* "haruspex" (*χix neθšrac* "liber haruspicianus"?); *turtntv frontac* "fulgurator" (*trutntv* "soothsayer"?).

79. A legendary justification for this, according to Censor. 4.13: it was the *lucumones* who were supposed to have set down the instructions of Tages in writing; according to Schol. Bern. ad Luc. *Phars.* 1.636, the same Tages *duodecim principum pueris disciplinam dictavit*. Cf. the "law" in Cic. *Leg.* 2.21: *Etruriaque principes disciplinam doceto*. In *Div.* 1.92 (see above, p. 609), the *principum filii* are Etruscans (see the discussion in Thulin III, p. 143, n. 2) rather than Romans (but Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire de la divination* 4:106 and n. 1).

80. Bouché-Leclercq, pp. 17-31; Thulin III.

thing that concerns the life of the state and of individuals. Festus (p. 386 L²) defines them as follows: *Rituales nominantur Etruscorum libri, in quibus praescriptum est quo ritu condantur urbes, arae aedes sacrentur, qua sanctitate muri, quo iure portae, quomodo tribus curiae centuriae distribuuntur, exercitus constituentur ordinentur, ceteraque eiusmodi ad bellum ac pacem pertinentia.*

But the *libri rituales* of which Verrius Flaccus speaks in this way, through Festus, were also compilations of the last centuries, in which the part representing Roman experience, translated into Etruscan doctrine, had to be even greater than in the *libri fulgurales* or *haruspici*: *quomodo exercitus constituentur ordinentur*, immediately following the mention of the *centuriae*, evokes the Field of Mars where the legions were formed. The Romans speaking of their own origins (and this was probably with even greater reason the case with Romanized Etruscans speaking of Rome) were inclined to stamp their practices with the respectable Etruscan label, which gave them the prestige of antiquity and a kind of intellectual warranty. The moderns go even further and readily give Etruria the credit for a number of things which are known only at Rome and which the Romans themselves did not attribute to it. These forms of Etruscomania must be regarded with distrust.

On the other hand, certain practices, even authentically and anciently Etruscan ones, may actually be borrowings by the Etruscans from the Italic peoples themselves, so that their conformity with Roman practice does not imply that Rome, in such a circumstance, is practicing an Etruscan rite, but is merely practicing an old Italic rite from which the Etruscans have created a theory which they have given back, in Etruscan form, to the Italic peoples and to the Latins of Rome. I shall cite here only one probable example of each of these two processes, and I shall start with the second.

The ancient authors say that Rome was founded *Etrusco ritu*.⁸¹ Thus Varro (L.L. 5.143): *Oppida condebant in Latio Etrusco ritu multi, id est iunctis bobus, tauro et uacca, interiore aratro circumagebant sulcum* (cf.

81. Thulin III, pp. 3-25; for the *mundus*, for which of course one or two Etruscan etymologies have been found, see above, pp. 350-53. I do not believe in what Piganiol calls *mundus* in the Etruscan tomb paintings, or in his interpretation of the altar of Consus in the Circus Maximus as a *mundus*, *Recherches sur les jeux romains* (1923), pp. 2-7.

Macr. 5.19.11). Thus too Plutarch (*Rom.* 11.1-5): Romulus, he tells us, had sent to Etruria for men competent to instruct him in the rites and formulas appropriate for each operation. A circular trench was dug around what was to be the Comitium, and into it were thrown the first-fruits of all things either regarded as good by nature or known to be necessary for life; then every one of those present threw into the trench a piece of earth brought from the place from which he came. This trench is the *mundus*, the center around which the outline of the city was traced in a circle. The founder himself, driving a plow yoked to a bull and a cow, plowed a deep furrow. Those who followed him saw to it that the clods of earth cast up by the plowshare all fell inward toward the center, and that no clod lay outside the circuit. Where they planned to make a gate, they took the plowshare out of the earth and carried the plow across. Without qualifying the procedure as Etruscan, Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1.88) says substantially the same thing, but according to him, the perimeter traced by the plow was quadrangular and not circular.

At whatever period they set the constitution of an entity called Rome, starting with the first encampments on the Palatine, and whatever meaning they give to the expression *Roma quadrata*, to which Dionysius alludes and which the Romans themselves did not clearly understand,⁸² modern scholars admit that the rites of foundation described are in fact Etruscan, and in particular that the digging of the *mundus* at the center of the plowed outline is an authentically Etruscan practice. They are even ready to extend this origin to the other, quite different thing to which the word *mundus* was applied at Rome, that is, to the well, normally covered but periodically opened, by which Rome communicated with the underworld, with the dead. It is in fact possible that the whole ritual, including the *mundus*, is Etruscan. On the other hand, it shows a remarkable correspondence with the archaic Vedic ritual by which the square, oriented sacrificial fire, the Indian homologue of the Italic *templum*,⁸³

82. Festus, p. 365 L², seems to confuse *Roma Quadrata* and *mundus* when he writes: "*Quadrata Roma* <locus> *in Palatino ante templum Apollinis dicitur ubi reposita sunt quae solent boni ominis gratia in urbe condenda adhiberi.*" See Lugli, *RA*, pp. 423-27.

83. The *templum* is often attributed to the Etruscans (in recent times, with an etymology in this sense), and some (Bouché-Leclercq) also attribute the augural art to them. Our studies lead us to claim both for the Indo-European heritage of the Italic peoples; see above, pp. 312-17, and *RIER* 2 ("Aedes rotunda Vestae"): 27-43 (esp. pp. 30-31, which are summed up here).

was delimited. In the Vedic ritual, the perimeter was marked by four furrows, first a straight one, extending from southwest to southeast, then another following a broken line which runs southwest, northwest, northeast, southeast. At the middle of this quadrilateral, precisely at the intersection of the diagonals, on a spot which they called the "mouth," the priests placed the symbolic equivalent of a *mundus*: a tuft of *darbha* ("which is both water and plant at the same time"), over which they poured twelve jars of water ("twelve are the months, the water is the rain") and cast the seeds "of all the herbs" ("that is, of all the foods"). This ritual is surely very old: while plowing the furrows, the officiating priest recites a formula which contains one of the most remarkable references to the Indo-Iranian grouping of the gods of the three functions (Mitra-Varuṇa, Indra, and the Aśvin), although the importance of this grouping had already been lessened in the hymns of the *Ṛg Veda*. The Italic peoples who occupied Italy and who, as we have seen, preserved the contrast between the round national hearth and the square, oriented *templa*, may also have brought with them the practice of the quadrangular plowing and the central "mouth," the symbolic depository of all good things. Thus if it is true that the classic *disciplina Etrusca* provided for the *urbs quadrata* and the *mundus*, it is possible that the Etruscans, along with their many other borrowings from their Italic predecessors, annexed, codified, and put their stamp on these ancient Indo-European customs.⁸⁴

The other example also concerns the foundation of cities.⁸⁵ It is the last chapter of the first book of Vitruvius, which we have already mentioned in connection with the Capitoline temple. This chapter is often cited as one of the very rare proofs that the grouping of Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva in a triad was not peculiar to the Tarquins of Rome, but rather conformed to a general Etruscan usage. It is necessary to read the chapter as a whole, and not merely to excerpt the passage which mentions the three divinities, as is always done, even by Thulin. It concerns the choice of locations suitable for public buildings:

84. On orthogonal plans of various periods in the Mediterranean countries and their neighbors, see F. Castagnoli, *Ipodamo di Mileto e l'urbanistica a pianta ortogonale* (1951); R. Martin, *L'urbanisme dans la Grèce antique* (1956); A. Boëthius, *The Golden House of Nero* (1960); R. Bloch, "A propos de l'Enéide de Virgile, réflexions et perspectives," *REL* 45 (1968).

85. See above, p. 307.

1. After apportioning the alleys and settling the main streets, the choice of sites for the convenience and common use of citizens has to be explained, for sacred buildings, the forum, and other public places. And if the ramparts are by the sea, a site where the forum is to be put is to be chosen next the harbour; but if inland, in the middle of the town. But for sacred buildings of the gods under whose protection the city most seems to be, for Jupiter and Juno and Minerva, the sites are to be distributed in the highest ground from which the most of the ramparts is to be seen. To Mercury, however, in the forum, or else as to Isis and Serapis, in the business quarter; to Apollo and Pater Liber against the theatre; to Hercules, in cities which have no gymnasia nor amphitheatres, at the circus; to Mars outside the walls but in the parade ground; and also to Venus near the harbour.

Now with Etruscan haruspices in the writings of their disciplines, the dedication is as follows [*id autem etiam Etruscis haruspibus disciplinarum scripturis ita est dedicatum*]: that the shrines of Venus, Volcanus, Mars are therefore to be situated outside the wall, so that venereal pleasure may not be customary to young men and matrons in the city, and, by summoning the power of Volcanus outside the ramparts with ritual and sacrifices, the buildings may seem to be freed from fear of fires. But since the divinity of Mars is dedicated outside the ramparts, there will not be armed quarrels among citizens, yet he will keep the ramparts defended from the danger of war.

2. Likewise the temple of Ceres should be outside the city, in a place which men will frequent only for purposes of worship [?], since that place must be kept religiously, purely and with strict manners. For the other gods too, the sites should be apportioned with a view to the nature of the cults which will be celebrated there [*ceterisque diis ad sacrificiorum rationes aptae templis areae sunt distribuendae*]. [The last paragraph of this passage is my translation.]

Is there any need to stress the fact that the writings of the Etruscan haruspices used here take into account all kinds of innovations which were foreign to their country, and in particular Roman conditions? Apollo and Dionysos with the theater, and Heracles with the gymnasium, the amphitheater, or the Circus, testify to Greek practices; Isis and Serapis have come an even greater distance; while Mars, with his Campus, and Ceres *extra urbem* appear strictly in their Roman settings. In such a context, what is the evidence concerning the Capitoline triad worth? Did the Tarquins really follow an "Etruscan" rule, or was it their work which inspired an "Etrusco-Roman" rule here? We cannot make a final decision, but a certain degree of doubt is in order. We should likewise entertain doubts with regard to

the only other mention of the "Etruscan triad" (Serv. Aen. 1.422): *prudentes Etruscae disciplinae aiunt apud conditores Etruscarum urbium non putatas iustas urbes, in quibus non tres portae essent dedicatae et tot uiae et tot templa Iouis Junonis Mineruae*. To be sure, this situation is not exactly what is seen at Rome, but it may have been the product of reflections and generalizations made by the Etrusco-Roman scholars about the group of divinities who had guaranteed Rome's splendid career.

The same suspicion, not of falsification but of adaptation, falls on most of the references which can be connected with the *libri rituales*. Festus includes the consecration of temples among the matters covered by this collection. But what is there that is ancient, or Etruscan, in our most circumstantial document, the consultation of the haruspices, under Vespasian, at the time of the restoration of the burned Capitol (Tac. Hist. 4.53)? First they order whatever remains of the old temple to be thrown into the marshes and the construction of new buildings on the exact lines of the old ones, since the gods do not wish any change in the plan. Then on 21 June, under a cloudless sky, all the space intended for the temple is decorated with fillets and garlands. Soldiers with *fausta* (auspicious) names enter the precincts bearing *felices* (lucky) boughs. Then the Vestals, accompanied by boys and girls of good omen, *patrimi* and *matrimi*, sprinkle the whole area with water. Preceded by the *pontifex maximus*, the praetor purifies the site by the sacrifice of the *suovetaurilia*, consecrates the entrails of the victims on clods of turf, invokes Jupiter, Juno, Minerva, and the guardian gods of the Empire, and touches the fillets and wreaths wound around the stones or entwined with the ropes. Then magistrates, priests, senators, knights, and a great number of common citizens begin to drag a huge rock chosen to serve as a foundation stone, while crude, unrefined gold and silver are tossed into the foundations, in accordance with an earlier injunction of the haruspices that no stone or gold which had been intended for any other purpose should profane the work. The new building was higher than the one which it replaced: this was the only variation which religion would permit, and the one feature which had been thought wanting in the old temple.

The same caution should be exercised in discussing the tribes and

the curiae—except perhaps for the organization of Mantua (Serv. Aen. 10.202)⁸⁶—or the few points of public or private law which the ancient authors specifically attribute to the Etruscans. Here are two examples of the latter: *est enim in libro qui inscribitur *terrae *iuris Etruriae scriptum uocibus Tage, eum qui genus a periuris duceret, fato extorrem et profugum esse debere* (Serv. Aen. 1.2);⁸⁷ *secundum Etruscam disciplinam nihil tam incongruum nubentibus quam terrae motus aut caeli* (ibid. 4.6). As for the three tribes of primitive Rome, it is improper to conclude from the Etruscan or Etruscanized form of two of their names (*Ramnes* and *Luceres*, as compared with *Titienses*) that the whole organization was Etruscan in origin: the tribes certainly antedate the last kings, who merely adjusted them slightly, under conditions of which the memory is preserved in the legend of Attus Navius. Similarly, among the eight known names (out of thirty) of the pre-Servian curiae, although *Tifata* actually reproduces the name of a hill near Etruscan Capua, three others (*Foriensis*, *Rapta*, and *Veliensis*) are immediately recognizable as Latin, *Acculeia* is no more explained by Etruscan than by Latin, and it is begging the question to explain the last three (*Faucia*, *Titia*, and *Velitia*) by Etruscan family names (*φαυχα*, *Titie*, *Veliθna*), since Latin supplies similar words, such as *faux*, *titus*, *uelites*.

The *libri fatales*, supposing that there really were such books, contained more plausibly Etruscan material; judging from the earliest Romans, the Italic peoples had not developed a theory of fate, and it was under the influence of the Greeks, and on the basis of obscure lesser divinities like the Parcae, that they formed such speculations.⁸⁸ Moreover, these *Dii Superiores et Inuoluti* whom we have encountered in the theory of thunderbolts, and who can be glimpsed both in the forefront and in the background of the Etruscan pantheon, have no equivalents in Rome any more than in Greece. But we know so little about the *libri fatales*, except for their existence, that we are free to seek in them, if such is our fancy, for a prototype of the *libri Sibyllini* of Rome.

86. See ME I: 404–5.

87. To justify Virgil's calling Aeneas *profugus*: he is the grandson of the forsworn Laomedon.

88. See above, pp. 499–500.

Among the fragments of doctrine which have been preserved, one of the most interesting, parallel with a fragment of the theory of thunderbolts, concerns the *prorogatio*, which somewhat mitigates the general attitude of fatalism: *fata differuntur tantum, nunquam penitus immutantur*, says Servius (*Aen.* 8.398).⁸⁹ This respite, or the maximum extent of this respite, is ten years for individuals, thirty years for states. Servius's interpolator adds a note which is valuable, despite its brevity: the *Etrusci libri* say that this postponement of impending misfortunes can be obtained first from Jupiter, and then from the Fates, *primo loco a Jove dicunt posse impetrari, post a fatis*. We should like to know how the prayer was addressed to the Fates, that is, undoubtedly to the "Higher and Veiled gods." We should also like to know what is meant by *primo loco* and *post*: are they successive and complementary portions of a single procedure? Or are they a first request followed by an appeal to a higher authority? The essential nature of the relations between Jupiter and the *Dii Superiores* is hidden behind this uncertainty.

The duration and the rhythm of life were of interest to the Etruscan scholars. Varro learned from the *libri fatales* that man's life unfolds over twelve seven-year periods.⁹⁰ Until the end of the tenth, that is, up to the age of seventy, appropriate rites can prolong the life-span, but beyond that point one must not ask for anything more, nor may one obtain anything more. Once the twelfth hebdomad has been passed, men "go out of their minds" (*a mente sua homines abire*), and the gods no longer send them any signs. The theory of the *saeculum*,⁹¹ if not the word, which may well be Latin, that is, *spatium uitae humanae longissimum partu et morte definitum* (*Censor.* 17.2), was formed or at least specified in this circle of reflections, and was later extrapolated in the life of cities (*Censor.* 17.5-6). This theory boldly set an inevitable term, a death, for collective human organizations, for Etruria itself, and for the Romans, the conquerors and heirs of Etruria.⁹² It is probable that in the final struggles for

89. Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire de la divination* 4: 89.

90. *Ibid.*, pp. 87-90.

91. *Ibid.*, pp. 90-93; Thulin III, pp. 63-75; C. Clemen, "Die etruskische Säkularrechnung," *SMSR* 4 (1928): 235-42.

92. In the *Tuscan Histories* which were compiled in the eighth century of the nation, as Varro states, it was indicated both how many centuries were granted to this race, and the duration of each of the elapsed centuries, and the prodigies by which the expiration of each was made known. Thus, it was written there that each of the first four centuries lasted

independence, and in the swift and total resignation which followed the conquest, this metaphysical defeatism played some role.⁹³

The surviving fragments of the *libri Acherontici*, which were attributed to Tages, as were the *fatales*, do not allow us to state whether they were or were not comparable to the Book of the Dead of the Egyptians, as is sometimes claimed. Some authors have supposed that the text written on the bandages of the mummy of Zagreb belonged to these *libri*: this is sheer imagination. Even the name is suspect. There is indeed, in a much-discussed inscription on an Etruscan vase, the word *axrum* (*axru-m?*); some have attempted to translate this word by "Acheron" (the context is of Alcestis brought back from the underworld), but in the title of the *libri*, the adjective may not be Etruscan but simply the translation of an indigenous expression into Greco-Latin. If it is Etruscan, it is a timely reminder of all that Etruria owed to Greece, including its representations of the underworld. Beyond the *prorogatio* (Serv. *Aen.* 8.398), we know one point of Acherontic doctrine calculated to console those who might resent the brevity of a lifetime limited to seventy or to eighty-four years: they can turn into gods. "In its *libri Acherontici*," says Arnobius (*Gent.* 2.62), "Etruria promises that by offering the blood of certain animals to certain divinities, souls may become divine and escape the condition of mortality." Servius (*Aen.* 3.168) likewise refers to a statement by Labeo in a treatise *de diis animalibus*, that there are certain sacrifices which bring about the transformation of the souls of men into gods, who are called *animales* as a reminder of their origin. A literal inter-

100 years; the fifth 123 years; the sixth 119, as well as the seventh; that the eighth was still in progress, and that beyond the eighth there still remained the ninth and tenth, after which the Etruscan name would cease to exist.

93. See above, p. 607, in Plutarch's *Life of Sulla*, the advice of the haruspices at the end of the eighth *saeculum*. But what is this evidence worth? Here is what Bouché-Leclercq says about it, *Histoire de la divination* 4:96-97: "The tone of this declaration scarcely inspires confidence either in the authenticity of the document or in the sincerity of the haruspices. The soothsayers show too great a preoccupation with their own image, and the universe is renewed at little expense if the most or least credit accruing to divination is one of the most noticeable effects of similar changes. To announce in this way the impending death of their nation, which Sulla was in fact going to destroy forever, the haruspices should have adopted a more solemn and more discreet tone. It is strange to see them babbling such nonsense in regard to such grave happenings, while, a half-century later, the haruspex Vulcatius divulges a less terrible secret only on peril of death [= the end of the ninth *saeculum*, announced by the comet which appeared at the death of Julius Caesar]. The tradition reported by Plutarch is thus suspect on more than one count, and one should not claim to convert it into dogmatic definitions."

pretation of these texts, which are our sole pieces of evidence, suggests that the deification was obtained *post mortem*, through an apparently rigorous sacrificial technique. This conception is as far removed from Orphism, which reserved the privileges of the Other World for those who had undergone initiation while they were still alive, as from Pythagoreanism with its transmigration of souls.⁹⁴ Etruria owes a great deal to Greece, but its ritual means of acquiring immortality, if it is really limited just to this magic, is all its own. On the other hand, the importance given to the hebdomad in the measuring of human life reminds us of the mystical uses of the number seven, not only in Greece but in Chaldea, and also in the Bible.⁹⁵

To this literature may be added the collections of *Ostentaria*, the lists of prodigies translated by the Etrusco-Romans of the first century B.C. In this area, especially since the Second Punic War, the Etruscans had been the informants and the regular experts called on by Rome's officials,⁹⁶ so that through the consultations which they gave, generally at the request of the Senate, we can observe their methods of investigation and the ways in which they announced their findings. The principal difference which separated Etruscan from Roman usage, until a fairly late date, has been indicated above:⁹⁷

94. The parallel established by Thulin III, p. 59, between Tages and Orpheus is artificial. Significantly, two studies on this matter have titles in the form of a question: H. Bulle, "Orphisch-pythagoräischer Glaube bei den Etruskern?" *Philologische Wochenschrift* 42 (1922), cols. 692-94 (short but excellent discussion of F. Weege's thesis in *Etruskische Malerei* [1921]); C. C. van Essen, *Did Orphic Influence on Etruscan Tomb Painting Exist?* diss. Utrecht (1927).

95. Suidas, *Lexikon*, s.v. *Τυρρηνία*, following "a qualified man who had written the history among the Etruscans," reproduces a cosmogony in which there is general agreement in seeing a hodgepodge of astrology and biblical conceptions, and which cannot be attributed to the Etruscans: "The god who created all things has allotted to all his creations twelve chiliads of years (12,000 years), which are themselves distributed among the twelve (astral) houses. In the first chiliad, God created heaven and earth; in the second, the firmament, which he calls the sky; in the third, the sea and all that there is on land; in the fourth, the great heavenly bodies, the sun, the moon, and the stars; in the fifth, all the birds, the reptiles, and the quadrupeds, in the air and on the land and in the waters; in the sixth, man. Thus it appears that the first six chiliads elapsed before the creation of man, and that the other six remain assigned to the human race, in such a way that the whole space of time up to the end amounts to twelve chiliads." "It is possible," writes Bouché-Leclercq, (pp. 98-99), "that the haruspices, caught between the Bible and astrology, may have borrowed from both sources to compose this compromise system; but it is also possible that it was done without them."

96. Bouché-Leclercq, pp. 74-86; Thulin III, pp. 76-130; Bloch, *Les prodiges dans l'antiquité classique*, pp. 42-76.

97. Above, p. 608.

while a prodigy for the Romans, was always a threat, expressing the wrath of a god, the Etruscans admitted the possibility that it might also indicate a friendly disposition and a favorable intention. One of the very few surviving fragments of the translation made by Tarquitiu Priscu of an *Ostentarium Tuscu* relates precisely to a good prodigy. Here it is, in Latin the strangeness of which does not seem to be due only to its oracular tone, but which betrays an overly slavish imitation—and we are delighted at this. In the third book of the *Saturnalia* of Macrobiu (7.2), concerning the ram, we read: *traditur autem in libris Etruscorum, si hoc animal insolito colore fuerit inductum, portendi imperatori rerum omnium felicitatem. Est super hoc liber Tarquiti transcriptus ex Ostentario Tusco. Ibi reperitur: "purpureo aureoue colore ouis ariesue si aspergetur, principi ordinis et generis summa cum felicitate largitatem auget, genus progeniem propagat in claritate laetioemque efficit."* Macrobiu's first sentence sums up this pompous jargon well enough, telling us that such purple or gold spots (or rather, since he is generalizing, any unusual color on the hide) pre-sage *felicitas* for the emperor in all things. This fragment, preserved by chance, is interesting in more than one respect: it manifests a fairly constant characteristic of the opinions of the haruspices, which has been mentioned earlier, namely, the definitely partisan importance which they attach to the great ones of this world; furthermore, we see Macrobiu, in his gloss, revealing, bringing up to date, and adapting to the new form of government (*imperator*) what Tarquitiu Priscu had expressed more generally, in terms which were as appropriate to republican Rome as to the former Etruscan states (*principi ordinis et generis*).

Another fragment of Tarquitiu, taken from an *Ostentarium arborarium*, gives the definition of the *infelices* trees; it is an example of the meticulous, lacunary, and arbitrary classifications which were used in this pseudo-science (Macr. 3.20.3). "The trees which are under the protection of the infernal gods, those gods who ward off [dangers?], are called *infelices*; they are the buckthorn, the blood-root, the fern, the black fig, all the trees whose berries or fruits are black, the service-tree, the wild pear tree, the holly, the blackberry bush, and the thorny shrubs. It is these which must be used to burn evil monsters and prodigies." This last prescription is illustrated by a few well-known cases in Roman history:⁹⁸ in 193, a swarm of wasps

98. Bloch, pp. 73-74.

which had had the misfortune to alight on a temple of Mars at Capua was carefully gathered up and burned (Liv. 35.9.4); two years later, two oxen which had succeeded in climbing to the roof of a building, in the Roman quarter of the Carinae, were burned alive at the order of the haruspices and their ashes cast into the Tiber (Liv. 36.37.2); Lucan is more specific (*Phars.* 1.589-91) when he has the soothsayer Arruns order monsters born by spontaneous generation burned *infaustis flammis*, that is, in a fire fed by *infelices* trees. Here we touch on the darker aspects of the theory of prodigies; there is nothing so cruel as the treatment of hermaphrodites, which the Romans borrowed from the Etruscans: the unfortunate creatures were shut up alive in a coffin and thrown into the sea (for example, in the year 142, Jul. Obs. 22, *praecepto haruspicum*).⁹⁹

Naturally it is through the Roman consultations that we can form an idea of the procedure followed by the haruspices. Like that of the *fulguratores*, it comprised, quite reasonably, three stages: the precise definition of the reported prodigy, the interpretation, and the recommendation of the remedies. The classic example, which was well analyzed by C. Thulin and treated again by R. Bloch,¹⁰⁰ is the *responsum* of the haruspices in 56, mentioned above; the part which was set down and commented on by Cicero (*Har. resp.* 20-60) concerns only the first two stages, the third being immaterial to his case. But the first two are plain:¹⁰¹

1. *Definition of the prodigy*: "Whereas, in the Latinian land a clatter accompanied by a rumbling has been heard; whereas, in the neighboring region a hollow noise and a frightening clangor of arms has been heard (20) . . ."

2. *Interpretation*, in three parts:

a) *The angry gods*: the complaints come from Jupiter, Saturn, Neptune, Tellus, and the celestial gods (20).

b) *Five causes of their wrath*: because games have been performed with too great laxity, and have been defiled (21); because sacred and hallowed sites are being used for secular purposes (9); because orators have been put to death in defiance of human and divine laws (34); because the pledged word and the oath have been forgotten (36); and again, because ancient and secret sacrifices have been performed too negligently and have been defiled (37).

99. Above, p. 482, n. 29. On a possible Etruscan origin of the rite of the *Argei*, see above, pp. 448-49.

100. Thulin III, pp. 78-79; Bloch, pp. 50-55.

101. Bouché-Leclercq, pp. 83-84.

c) *The dangers which threaten*: the immortal gods warn men to beware lest, through the discord and disagreement of those in high places, murders and perils be wrought for the Conscript Fathers and for the statesmen, who would find themselves bereft of help and abandoned, as a result of which the provinces would place themselves under a single rule, with the army driven off and a final decline (40). They also warn men to beware lest public business be injured by secret plots (55); lest disreputable and rejected men be elevated in dignity (56); and finally lest the form of government be changed (60).

In the third part we recognize the conservative conformity, the "right-thinking" coloration of the haruspices' opinions. The kind of menaces, grave and vague at the same time, and the turgid style are exactly those of the brontosopic calendar: the literary genre required such formulas and almost never departed from them. As for the second part, particularly the determination of the angered gods, Thulin admired its precision, which he contrasted with the discreet reserve of Rome's pontiffs in similar matters: "Aulus Gellius, 2.28.3, says, following Varro, that when there was an earth tremor, the pontiffs were incapable of identifying the divinity who had sent the sign, and endeavored to get out of it by means of the expression *si deo, si dae*. How different is the response of the haruspices reported above: *postiliones esse Joui Saturno Neptuno Telluri Dis caelestibus!* Expressions such as the one we read in Liv. 41.13.2, *editis ab aruspibus dis quibus supplicaretur*, show that the haruspices were no less capable of determining the divinities who had to be placated than the decemvirs. We do not know what procedures they followed. Given the great variety of the *Ostenta*, they must not have been limited to a single method."¹⁰² It may be thought that the examination of the liver of a victim, with its precise divine localizations, provided the list of angered gods. Jupiter, Saturnus, and Neptunus are inscribed on the liver of Piacenza—and probably, with names which we cannot understand, Tellus and the Di Caelestes.

The Etruscan *procuratio* of prodigies is known only through what the Romans borrowed from it: for this, refer to the Roman part of this volume.¹⁰³

102. Thulin III, p. 82.

103. See above, pp. 603-4.

THE GODS

When we observe the Etruscan pantheon in the documents written in the native language, that is, on the *objets d'art* or on the liver of Piacenza, two dominant facts are apparent.

The first, which has been alluded to several times, is the great number of divine names borrowed from the Italic languages. In particular, a quantity of thoroughly Etruscan gods bear Latin names, distorted but recognizable. If this is not the case with *Tinia* (Jupiter), it is true of a goddess who was certainly imported, *Uni*, derived from *Juno* with the same loss of initial *i*- that can be observed in *Ani*, derived from *Janus*;¹⁰⁴ it is also true of *Neθuns* (*Neθunus*; Zagreb *Neθuns-l*), derived from *Neptunus*; of *Maris* (*Mariś*, *Mars-*, *Mares*), that is, *Mars*. It is very probably true of the *Vetis-l* and the *Satres* which are found only on the liver of Piacenza, that is, *Vedius-Veiouis* and *Saturnus*; and of *Selvans-l* (*selvan-*; *selva* on the liver), that is, *Siluanus*.¹⁰⁵ These divinities have only one name, the one which they had in the country of their origin, whether they were wholly borrowed, the person along with the name, or whether, as native gods, after having been assimilated to ancient foreign divinities through the inverse operation of an *interpretatio Etrusca*, they lost their native names and carried on their existence under the foreign ones. In a few cases, a single divinity seems to bear both an indigenous and a foreign name: *Men(e)rva* (*Merva*, *Mera*) is often regarded as identical with *Tecvm* (on the liver and at Zagreb); it is possible that the letters *Vel-*, on the liver, are the beginning of **Velχans*, a name which would duplicate the earlier *Seθlans*, whom the mirrors clearly portray as a Hephaistos.¹⁰⁶ Some scholars also claim to have encountered cases in which two divinities of the same type, one native, the other borrowed, coexisted without being confused: *Laran*, who appears nine times on the mirrors, nude, booted, almost always armed and helmeted, sometimes with Turan-Aphrodite, would, they assert, be the warrior god who was duplicated by *Mars* (*Torp*, *Thulin*, etc.). But, among a bellicose people, warlike activity may well receive several differently

104. Thulin, *Die Götter des Martianus Capella* . . . , p. 23.

105. Similarly with *Fufluns* and **Populoni*, G. Devoto, *SE* 6 (1932): 243-60.

106. Thulin, *Die Götter des Martianus Capella* . . . , p. 42.

oriented divine patrons (cf. Indra and Vāyu among the Indo-Iranians).¹⁰⁷

The second fact is the early and stable assimilation of a large number of these divinities to Greek divinities. The illustrations on the mirrors¹⁰⁸ show *Tinia* and *Uni* only in the functions and the adventures of Zeus and Hera. *Tinia* wields the scepter and the thunderbolt, and Athena is born from his head;¹⁰⁹ *Uni*, associated with *Tinia* as Hera is with Zeus, appears in the judgment of Paris along with Aphrodite and Athena, nurses Heracles, and is freed from her chains by Hephaistos.¹¹⁰ *Menrva*, armed and accompanied by a little hovering Victory, portrays Athena.¹¹¹ *Neθun(u)s*, with the trident of Poseidon, sits on a rock from which water gushes.¹¹² This process of identification affects even divinities who bear only Etruscan names. Even if the cognomen of one of the oldest Venuses of the Latins, *Frutis*, can be explained by an Etruscan pronunciation of Aphrodite,¹¹³ it is *Turan* who corresponds to that goddess on the mirrors; likewise, *Turms* wears the chlamys and the petasus and carries the caduceus of Hermes, and conducts the souls of the dead (the Greek name is transcribed just once, *herma*, but this is only a freak: the Etruscan Hermes is definitely *Turms*).¹¹⁴ *Fufluns* wears the thyrsus of Dionysos, and is shown near *Semla* (Semele) and *Areatha* (Ariadne).¹¹⁵ So it is with all the authentic divinities. If we see *Aplu* (*Apulu*, *Aplun*) on the mirrors, crowned with laurels, provided with the phorminx, and embraced by

107. Thus, along with the Ani on the Piacenza liver, there would be an Etruscan "Janus": G. Devoto, "Nomi di divinità etrusche, III: *Culsanś*," SE 7 (1933): 259-65. On the Dioscuri in Etruria, see above, p. 414.

108. The documents are found in the corpus of the mirrors compiled by E. Gerhard, see below, p. 696; J. D. Beazley, "The World of the Etruscan Mirror," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 69 (1949): 1-17. On the Etruscan statuaries, see M. Pallottino, *La scuola di Vulca* (1945) (in connection with the statues at Veii); A. Hus, *Recherches sur la statuaire en pierre étrusque archaïque* (1961).

109. References, e.g., in Thulin, *Die Götter des Martianus Capella* . . . , p. 24, to Gerhard's corpus of the mirrors.

110. *Ibid.*, pp. 24-25.

111. See below, p. 677-79.

112. Thulin, *Die Götter des Martianus Capella* . . . , pp. 25-26; on *Neptunus* as an Italic and not an Etruscan name, see above, p. 389, n. 29.

113. See above, p. 453 and n. 16. There must also have been a name *Apru* (*Ἀφρώ*) of Aphrodite, which could provide the Latin name of this goddess's month, *Aprilis*: E. Benveniste, "Trois étymologies latines," BSL 32, 1 (1931): 68-74; supported by E. Fiesel, "Zu Benveniste's Deutung von Aprilis," SE 7 (1933): 295-97.

114. Thulin, *Die Götter des Martianus Capella* . . . , p. 18, n. 3.

115. *Ibid.*, p. 25.

Letun; if we see *Artumes* playing the cithara close to *Apulu* or astride a stag,¹¹⁶ this is only the pictorialization of literature, and does not imply that Apollo, Artemis, or Latona had a role in the religion of the Etruscans. This literature was not without its own religious or social importance: it was probably through the medium of Etruscan spellings that Persephone became Proserpina on the banks of the Tiber, while *Catmite*, the Etruscan Ganymede, must have had some substance to have given Plautus and Roman slang their *catamitus*.¹¹⁷

The study of the Etruscan transcriptions of the names from Greek fable led Mrs. Eva Fiesel, in 1928, to make a number of sound and surprising observations, as well as a statement of great importance:¹¹⁸ Etruria acquired these names at various periods and from various Greek countries. They can be divided roughly into three groups: (1) most of them come from the epic, Ionian tradition (*Castur*, *Nestur*, *Sature*, *Patruclcs*, etc.); (2) these names were combined in the language with an earlier stock of names taken from a Dorian dialect, from which they preserved the long *ā* and the digamma, and sometimes in a less predictable form (*Aivas* from the Corinthian *AiFas*; *Maḡan*, from *Μαχάων*; *Prumathe*-Prometheus; *Pakste*-Pegasus; *Velparun*-Elpenor; etc.); (3) but even the second group were not the first to arrive; others, whose form is inexplicably remote from the Greek form, go back to a pre-Hellenic prototype, of which the Greek form is another, generally "etymologizing" distortion (*Catmite*-Γανυμήδης [*Γαδυ-?], *Heplenta*-Ἰππολύτη, *Talmiḡe*-Παλαμήδης, *fulḡsna*-Πολυξένη, etc.). Actually, the third category is doubtful: *Γανυμήδης* certainly has a pre-Hellenic name and is a pre-Hellenic figure, but the *Catmite* of the mirrors is precisely and solely the Ganymede of Greek fable, the cup-bearer of a Zeus who was not himself borrowed at some pre-Hellenic date.

116. *Ibid.*, p. 18, nn. 1 and 2.

117. F. Messerschmidt, "Griechische und etruskische Religion," *SMSR* 5 (1929): 21-32: "Die Wurzeln der Entstehung einer griechisch-etruskischen Mischkultur liegen schon im achten Jahrhundert, wo die ersten Arbeiten des griechischen Handwerks, Vasen protokorinthischer Fabriken, vereinzelt auch spätgeometrische Produkte durch phönikische Händler nach Italien kamen, und schnell wie in Unteritalien auch an der tyrrhenischen Küste Nachahmung fanden" (p. 21).

118. *Namen des griechischen Mythos im Etruskischen*. See E. Benveniste's important review, *RPh.* 56 (1930): 67-75. More recently, G. Camporeale, "Bannalizzazioni etrusche di miti greci," *Studi in onore di Luisa Banti* (1965), pp. 111-23 (insisting on the distortions and concluding that the Etruscans did not penetrate deeply into the myths of their Greek models); contrary remarks, based on other documents, in R. Hampe and E. Simon, *Griechische Sagen in der früheren etruskischen Kunst* (1964).

Whatever the pre-Hellenic word may have been which was distorted and rationalized as *Πολυξένη* (if this name does not quite simply mean what it appears to mean in Greek), the Etruscans certainly did not adopt this daughter of Priam except as part of the whole legend of Troy and in the place which she occupied in that legend, thus at the same time as they adopted Patroclus, Achilles, etc.; the contrary hypothesis involves us in difficulties larger than the one caused by the lack of agreement between the names. The distinction between a Dorian source and an Ionian source is certain, however, and would be extremely interesting if it were also certain that the Etruscans owed their alphabet to the Dorians of Greece proper.¹¹⁹ "Through the medium of Corinth," writes Benveniste, "whose role had not been erased from the memory of the Romans (Tac. *Ann.* 11.14), the Etruscans may have received, along with the alphabet, the treasury of the Hellenic myths. Thus it is not immaterial that the name *Vilae*, Vile of Iolaos agrees with the Corinthian form *FiόλαFos*, or *Aevas*, *Aives*, etc., with the Corinthian *ΑἶFos*."

It is not easy for us to imagine the functioning of a mythology, and hence of a religion, in which the principal goddesses, for example, bear names borrowed from the Italic peoples, *Uni*, *Menrva*, and are on the other hand invested with the rich accessories which the legend and art of Greece give to *Hera* and *Athena*. Nevertheless, it is a fact, and one of great importance for the history of the religion of Rome itself: if the work of assimilation of the Roman divinities to the Greek divinities was accomplished so early and so completely, it was done in imitation of Etruria, and almost always with the same elements; Juno, Minerva, Neptunus, and plenty of others, became *Hera*, *Athena*, and *Poseidon* in the steps of *Uni*, *Menrva*, and *Neθuns*. The others followed these great examples: in this way the triple equivalences such as *Venus-Turan-Aphrodite* and *Mercurius-Turms-Hermes* were established.

It is exceptional to surprise one of these divinities in a function or a myth which is not Italic or Greek. A "goddess of the serpents," in

¹¹⁹. See references in Benveniste, in *RPh.* 56: 69-70. This origin is still disputed; see especially M. Lejeune, "Observations sur l'alphabet étrusque," *Tyrrhenica, saggi di studi etruschi* (1957), pp. 158-72; in any case, a variety of *M* seems to be a creation which is truly Etruscan, J. Heurgon, "Note sur la lettre A dans les inscriptions étrusques," *Studi in onore di Luisa Banti*, pp. 177-89.

whom some claim to see a Turan, appears on a plaque found in a funeral chamber in Caere, and from this a role in the service of the dead has been deduced for her, which might serve as a prototype for the Venus Libitina of Rome;¹²⁰ but does not the twenty-third *Roman Question*, which relates precisely to Libitina, remind us that a statuette of Aphrodite Epitymbia was seen at Delphi, near to which the dead were summoned in order to taste the libations?

The mythology of the Etruscan Mars does not depend on the Greek Ares, but there are serious reasons for assigning the most original elements of this mythology to the Etruscans' Indo-European neighbors.¹²¹

A mirror from Bolsena, a mirror from Chiusi, and a scene portrayed on the famous Etrusco-Latin basket (*cista*) of Palestrina (Praeneste) form a group of related documents. (1) On the *cista*, in the middle of a row of gods with Latin names (Juno, Jupiter, Mercury, Hercules, Apollo, Liber, Fortuna, etc.), a central group, consisting of Minerva and Mars, is engaged in a singular operation. Mars, nude, helmeted, and armed with a spear and buckler, crouches over a large vessel filled with some boiling substance (liquid? vapor? fire?). Minerva is passing her left arm around his waist, and with her right hand brings a kind of short stick to his mouth or nose. The goddess's buckler and helmet are placed behind her on a pile of stones, while a little Victory hovers above her. Above Mars, breaking the leafy decoration of the frieze, can be seen a seated Cerberus, a dog or wolf with three heads. (2) On the mirror from Chiusi, the following figures are shown, from left to right: a naked young man, *Leinθ*, holding a spear in his left hand, and with a child, *Marišhalna*, on his flexed right thigh (the child is clinging with both hands to his pendent right arm); then *Turan*, the Etruscan Aphrodite; in the middle of the mirror, *Menerva*, helmeted and pulling the child *Marišhusrnana* out of an amphora by his arms; on the right, an unnamed nude young man, leaning with his right hand on his spear. On the handle of the

120. Grenier, in *Mana*, p. 53; in fact, the author of the article, F. Messerschmidt (and not F. Weege), p. 370, dismissed the association with Turan: "Eine Schlangengöttin aus Caere," *ARW* 37 (1941): 364-90.

121. See my study "Mariš Isminθians," *RPh.* 28 (1954): 9-18 (discussing J. Heurgon, "D'Apollon Smintheus à P. Decius Mus: la survivance du dieu au rat, *Sminth-*, dans le monde étrusco-latin," *Atti del primo congresso internazionale di preistoria e protostoria mediterranea* [1950], pp. 483-88); references to Gerhard's corpus will be found there.

mirror there is in addition a female figure, named *Recial*. (3) On the mirror from Bolsena there can be seen, from left to right: *Turms*, with the winged hat and the caduceus of *Hermes*, and with one hand holding around the waist the child *Marisisminθians*, seated on his flexed thigh; then the helmeted *Menrva*, bathing *Marishusrnana* in an amphora: with her right hand she leans on her spear, and with her left she holds the child's left arm and pulls him out of the bath; then *Turan*; then a young man dressed in a chlamys and leaning on his spear; than a woman, *Amatutun*, carrying the child *Marishalna* seated in the hollow of her left hand. Under the central scene is *Hercle*, recognizable by his club, with his legs concealed by a row of five amphoras of the same type but less decorated than the one from which *Marishusrnana* is emerging.

The archaeologists have commented on these pictures with a great deal of boldness, admitting a plurality of *Marses*, whose common father is supposed to be *Hercle*, while the female figures—*Menrva*, *Turan*, and *Amatutun*—are his mothers. This is drawing too far-reaching conclusions from these documents: they depict operations but do not suggest kinship. In any case, there is general agreement that they show scenes of juvenile initiation, which I have proposed to make more specific: namely, warlike initiation, which justifies the chief action, and which is suggested without exception by the attributes of all the characters shown. It is likely that the three *Marses*, variously qualified, are one and the same *Mars* at three stages of the initiation.¹²²

Mr. Hermansen has ingeniously compared these representations with a passage in the *Varia historia* of Aelian (9.16), where it is said that the Ausones of Italy had an ancestor named *Mares*, a centaur, who lived 123 years (a total which can be explained by number mysticism: Censor. 17.5) and who enjoyed the privilege of living three lives. He has also connected them with the lines in the *Aeneid* (8.563–67) in which Evander relates how, in his youth, he fought and killed King *Herulus*, whose mother, *Feronia*, had provided him with three souls, so that it was necessary to overthrow him three times.

These comparisons are in fact seductive, as is also the type of explanation which Hermansen proposes: that the scenes on the mirrors and the box are comparable to the act of *Thetis* plunging her son into the fire in order to make him invulnerable; in other words, a juvenile initiation. But we are surprised

122. I reproduce here some passages from my NR, pp. 64–66, debating G. Hermansen, *Studien über den italischen und den römischen Mars* (1940), pp. 49–82. See above, pp. 243–44.

to see Mr. Hermansen minimizing the element which is evidently essential throughout: the warlike element. Minerva is either armed (in the mirrors) or ostensibly accompanied by her arms (on the *cista*). The Mars on the *cista* is himself armed, and the Minerva who is embracing him is topped by a Victory. Nude young men in arms appear on the mirrors, representing as it were living conclusions to the preceding scenes. If the privilege of Aelian's Mares, to be born and to die three times, is not formally attributed to death in battle, it is at least the meaning which Virgil gives to the homologous privilege of Herulus. We must therefore complete Mr. Hermansen's interpretation by putting all of these details back into their legitimate place and meaning: the scenes under consideration probably represent the initiation ceremonies (or successive initiations) of the warrior-type, of Mars, through which he must acquire what is ordinarily acquired in this way, invulnerability, or the infallibly fatal blow, or a transfiguring *furor*. The readers of my essay *Horace et les Curiaces*, with the help of the Indian, Irish, and Scythian facts which I used in order to clarify the Roman tradition, will have no trouble in giving a plausible meaning to the scene on the *cista* from Palestrina: the threefold adversary in his pure form of the three-headed monster, the young warrior in arms bathed by a woman in a boiling tub, will not surprise them, any more than the multiplicity of the "young Marses" on the mirrors. The myth portrayed here is no more than a remarkably archaic form of the Italic and Celtic myth whose existence I have been led to assume, a myth which is still well preserved in the legend of the warlike initiation of the Irish hero Cúchulainn, and which, humanized and presented in historical terms, gave the Roman annalistic tradition its first material for the story of Horatius and the Curiatii.¹²³

In fact, the only mythological figure who seems to have possessed an original mythology in Etruria—or various mythologies in the various localities—beyond the traditional stock of legends is Heracles, or, in the form with which he is invested, *Hercle*. He was extremely popular there, and cities made use of his name: Manto, the eponym of Mantua, was his daughter, while Volaterrae, Vetulonia, and Populonia engraved his head on their coins. J. Bayet attempted to organize the confused and inadequate dossier of the localizations and the movements of the cult, and of the characteristics, differing from place to place, of the personage.¹²⁴ Moreover, by carefully studying

123. I have taken up the question from another point of view in *The Destiny of the Warrior* (1970), parts I and III.

124. *Les origines de l'Hercule romain* (1926), pp. 79–120 ("Héraclès-Herclé dans le domaine étrusque").

the scenes on the mirrors and the vases in which Hercle appears, he uncovered more than one instance in which Etruria modified the Greek tradition, perhaps, he thinks, under the influence of what the Phoenicians said about Melkart.¹²⁵ Thus Hercle is sometimes subordinated to his companion *Vilae* (Iolaos)—whom the Etruscans may have assimilated to the "Lybico-Carthaginian Ioel."¹²⁶ Thus too, in particular, the hero's marked liking for women involved him in Etruria in new adventures, in which Turan-Aphrodite and Menrva herself figure,¹²⁷ as well as the mysterious woman called *Mlax*¹²⁸—who probably has nothing in common with the Roman *Malacia* (for *Salacia*?), who is mentioned along with Neptune in a Tironian note.

The tablets inscribed in Etruscan and Punic which were quite recently found in the sanctuary at Pyrgi, one of the harbors of Caere, and which date from around 500 B.C., have added a single but significant element to our understanding of the game of "interpretationes." Saint Augustine, *Quaest. in Heptateuchum* 7.16, did indeed remark that *lingua Punica Juno Astarte uocatur*, but his comment did not attract attention, since the "Carthaginian Juno" was definitely Tanit. Today we know that the assimilation was exact and early, as far as Uni, the Etruscan Juno, is concerned. Until the Etruscan text can be interpreted with some degree of certainty, here is the translation of the Punic text made by A. Dupont-Sommer:¹²⁹

¹To the Lady Astarte.

This sacred place, ²it is what has been made and what has been given by ³Tebarie Velianas (*TBR Y' WLNŠ*) king over ⁴Kayišraie (*KYŠRY'*, that is, Cisra, Caere), in the month of the sacrifice ⁵to the Sun, as his (own) gift, comprising the temple and its high place, ⁶because Astarte has favored her faithful one: ⁷in the year 3 of his reign, in the month of ⁸KRR, on the day of the Burial ⁹of the goddess.

And may the years in which the statue of the Goddess will reside ¹⁰in her temple be years as numerous as those stars ¹¹yonder.

125. *Hercle, étude critique des principaux monuments relatifs à l'Hercule étrusque* (1926).

126. *Ibid.*, pp. 172-75.

127. *Ibid.*, pp. 217-23.

128. *Ibid.*, pp. 198-216; cf. F. de Ruyt, "À propos de l'interprétation du groupe étrusque Hercle-Mlacukh," *Mélanges F. Cumont* 2 (1936): 665-73.

129. "L'inscription punique récemment découverte à Pyrgi (Italie)," *JA* 252 (1964): 289-302; the translation is on p. 292. The author assures me (1968) that there is nothing he wishes to change in this translation.

The Etruscan text leaves no doubt as to the native name of this Astarte:

*ʿita tmia icac he ʿramaova [...] vatiexe ʿunialastres θemia ʿsa mex θuta θefa
ʿriei velianas sal cluvenias turuce . . .*

Just as we can recognize the name of the donor, *θefariei Velianas*, so we can identify the goddess *Uni* in the genitive *Unial-*, which occurs elsewhere. The second element of the word, *-astres*, remains a mystery. Pallottino sees it as a distortion of the name Astarte, and thinks that in the Etruscan text the goddess is designated by both her native name and the name of her Punic counterpart.¹³⁰ This is not very likely. Moreover, he himself reminds us that there exist parallel forms “con suffissi genitivali complessi,” *spurestres*, *sacnistres*, etc. But there is no doubt about the important fact: Uni is equivalent to *ʿSTRT*, Astarte.

Knotty problems are raised by this text: the references to months and to festivals are Punic. One—the day of the burial of the goddess (or of the god?)—alludes to a rite and a myth which indeed seem to belong to the Punic religion (cf. the descent of the Mesopotamian Ishtar, or the burial of Adonis);¹³¹ and at first Dupont-Sommer comments on the entire inscription as if the Etruscan king were paying homage to the genuine goddess Astarte:

The most striking fact attested by the Punic inscription is the profound and total devotion of the Etruscan king to the great Semitic goddess. If we have correctly translated line 6, this king is proclaiming himself “her faithful one.” Here, around the year 500 B.C. (for such is the approximate date suggested by both epigraphy and archaeology), is the first Semitic sanctuary to be erected, at least to our knowledge, on Italian soil, and it is erected by an Etruscan. One might even say that this Etruscan has adopted the Phoenician calendar, with its names of the months and its religious festivals. And the sanctuary which he offers the goddess includes a temple and a *bâmâh*, like those of Phoenicia, Cyprus, and Carthage. Here we first catch sight of that strange fascination which the Eastern cults will exercise over the peoples of Italy throughout so many centuries! The Etruscan king who is converted to the cult of the Phoenician goddess, who raises a “high place” to her, who celebrates her festivals, and who attributes to her a victory which he has

130. In *Archeologia classica* (see above, n. 3), p. 85.

131. Dupont-Sommer, “L’inscription punique . . .,” pp. 296–97.

just won over his enemies—this is what the text of the Punic inscription informs us of, or at least allows us to imagine.¹³²

Thereupon, however, he wisely adds:

But what do the Etruscan inscriptions, for their part, have to say? Will they confirm this impression given by the Punic inscription of an integral adoption of the Semitic cult by the Etruscan king? Or does the Punic text, drafted by a Phoenician or a Carthaginian, indicate these traits of Semitization in an exaggerated way, and will the Etruscan text, drafted by an Etruscan scribe, present a version in which these exotic traits will be less conspicuous?

Even in this case, the inscription of Pyrgi attests, on behalf of the Semitic world, to the extreme malleability of the Etruscan theology, a theology ready for assimilations, ready to welcome an entire mythical and ritual matter under an Etruscan name, by virtue of a foreign divine name which was regarded as equivalent. This Carthaginian vogue is satisfactorily explained by the politics of the time. Dupont-Sommer recalls (Herod. I.166–67) the alliance and the joint victory of the Tyrrhenians and the Carthaginians, around 540, over the Phocaeans who had settled in Corsica. Among the combatants and the beneficiaries of the victory, Herodotus singles out the people of Agylla, that is, precisely, of Caere. But this infatuation does not last, and ultimately it is Greece which pours out its treasury of ideas and representations in a steady flow onto Etruria. It is nonetheless valuable to be able to identify this goddess under her four names, Juno-Uni-Astarte-Hera.

For most of the Etruscan divinities who did not benefit from an *interpretatio graeca*, it is prudent to confine oneself to cataloging the data, without attempting to interpret them. Only those who believe they understand the bandages of the Zagreb mummy, the tile of Capua, the cippus of Perugia, and the leads of Magliano, Volterra, Monte Pitti, and Chiusi, also believe that they can talk about them usefully. They even invent divinities if the occasion offers, like the “Gottheit *cisum*,” and, into the bargain, the “Gottesbezeichnung” *matan*, which Runes has dug out of the bandages, and of which he boldly says, “Im CIE II 5525 kommt in Z. 2 *cisum tameru* vor, was

132. Ibid., p. 298. The reader will remember the ivory tablet which was found at Carthage at the end of the last century, and on which Benveniste deciphered the Etruscan word meaning “Carthaginian,” *Karθagie* (< **Karthad-*, cf. *Carthada* as the name for Carthage in Solin. 27.10, following Cato); it seems to be a question “of an Etruscan who was proclaiming himself a Carthaginian”: *SE* 7 (1933): 245–49.

offenbar Priesterin der Gottheit *cisum* bedeutet."¹³³ Nevertheless it does happen that one is able to clarify the other personages, those whose names are mysterious, with the help of the scenes portrayed and the Greek personages which they contain.

Thus Turan-Aphrodite is surrounded by a group of *ornatrices*, whose function is that of the Charites and the Horai, but who bear individual Etruscan names: *Alpan(u)*, *Axvizr*. Benveniste thought that he could clarify *Axvizr* (*Acaviser*) by the Greek, or rather by a Hellenized pre-Hellenic name, preserved on the island of Samothrace:¹³⁴ there, among the Cabiri, an *Ἀξίεπος* (this may be an earlier **Axriver-*) was worshiped, whom the scholiast of Apollonius of Rhodes (1.917) assimilates to Demeter (the other two Cabiri, *Axiokersa* and *Axiokersos*, being assimilated to Persephone and to Hades). Now, on a mirror (Gerhard, *Etruskische Spiegel* 4: cccxxiv) we see *Axvizr* next to *Alpanu*. "The latter, her hair bound by a wide fillet, has her left arm around the waist of *Axvizr*, whose face she is bringing close to her own as if for a kiss, and holds in her right hand an apple still attached to the branch. Following an acute remark by Gerhard (4: 61-62), we think right away of the return of Persephone to Demeter." The interpretation is tempting, and its consequences would be great, but of course it cannot be proved: the tender scene between *Alpanu* and *Axvizr* can be interpreted otherwise than as a reunion. Just as the *Amores* play around Venus, it is conceivable that the charming attendants of Aphrodite-Turan entertain themselves by eating fruits and by demonstrating their affection for one another.¹³⁵

Sometimes the uncertainty extends to the divinity's sex. To be sure, as Benveniste strongly emphasized, the switching of sex is frequently only a scribal error: on two fifth-century mirrors the names *Heplenta* (*Ἰππολύτη*) and *Pentasilē* (*Πενθεσιλεία*) are assigned to men. Thus when we see the (generic?) term *Lasa* used nine times to designate goddesses and appearing once over the figure of a young man, it is likely that the latter case is a mistake. But what are we to do with *Leinθ*? A masculine figure with this name, a warrior armed with a

133. *SE* 11 (1937): 239-40.

134. "Nom et origine de la déesse étrusque *Acaviser*," *SE* 3 (1929): 249-58.

135. With no Greek comparison, Benveniste studied another female figure, *Alsir* on a *cista* from Praeneste, and also *Altria* on a mirror (< **Alsir-ia*, through the addition of *-ia*, a secondary feminine suffix), who has the role of Aphrodite in distorted scenes of the Judgment of Paris; *SE* 7 (1933): 249-52.

spear, has been mentioned above, in the initiation scenes of the young Mars, whereas *Leinθ*, on a mirror from Perugia, is a female person from the underworld, the upper part of her body veiled, who seems to be turning aside while another woman, *Mean*, places a laurel wreath on Herclē, who is departing and leading Cerberus away.¹³⁶

GROUPINGS OF GODS

There is no religion which does not impose an order, a more or less rigid, more or less coherent, more or less complete structure upon the bulk of its representations, particularly of its gods. The Etruscans cannot have been an exception to this rule, but they have kept their secret.

There was no single Greek theology, but rather many theologies, formed in the cities or ripened in the schools, with Athens organizing her gods in a different way from Sparta, and the Orphics in a different way from the Pythagoreans; just so there cannot have been a single Etruscan theology, despite the unifying factor constituted by the corps of haruspices, who surely maintained constant communication among themselves across political boundaries, regardless of the rivalries of the cities. Of these local peculiarities we know nothing. How, for example, did the Veians arrange their divine services around the Juno who ended by preferring the soldiers of Camillus to them?¹³⁷

Is it at least possible to determine, over and above the hierarchy, a systematic grouping? It is not even certain that Tinia, by himself, had the privileged position which is guaranteed to him in the Etrusco-Latin documents by his assimilation to Zeus-Jupiter.¹³⁸ As for the Jupiter-Juno-Minerva triad, the doubts which assail its antiquity have been mentioned above. Even if the excavations prove the theory that the Etruscans had a particular taste, before the example

136. Gerhard, *Etruskische Spiegel* 2: 153, pl. 166, and 135, pl. 141.

137. S. Ferri, "La Juno Regina di Vei," *SE* 24 (1955-56): 106-14.

138. R. Pettazzoni, "La divinità suprema degli Etruschi," *SMSR* 4 (1928): 207-34, with regard to Vortumnus "deus Etruriae princeps" in Varro, *L.L.* 5.46 (on whom see above, pp. 339-40).

of the Capitol, for temples with three *cellae*,¹³⁹ and thus for combinations of three gods, this does not prove that the three gods were invariably these three, or the same ones. The generous interpretation made by P. Ducati in this context of the temples on the detached Etruscan acropolis at Marzabotto, near Bologna, is an example of the liberties to which interpretative archaeology may abandon itself.¹⁴⁰

The three systematizations of the Etruscan pantheon which are at our disposal are all late and learned, and as such cannot be attributed to "the religion" of an independent, pre-Roman Etruria. One is found in the theory of thunderbolts; it is very incomplete and, as we have seen, loaded with Greek speculations. The second is inscribed on the liver of Piacenza; it is very rich, since it contains forty terms, but its interpretation is difficult, as much because of the great number of abbreviations as through the uncertainties inherent in any topographic symbolism for which no key has been provided. The third can be read in the first book (41-61) of the curious treatise by Martianus Minneus Felix Capella entitled *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*; it has the advantage of being discursive and well presented, but it is late—from the fifth century of our era—and literary; it too is loaded with Greek and Greco-Latin speculations, and we cannot determine with what degree of freedom the author used his sources. Here is the summary of this text, which is nevertheless indispensable:

Invitations are directed by Jupiter's scribe or by Jupiter himself to various kinds of deities. The classification used for that purpose is: (1) the *Senatores deorum*, also called *Penates Jouis* and *Consentes*

139. L. Banti, "Il culto del cosiddetto 'tempio dell' Apollo' a Veii e il problema delle triadi etrusco-italiche," *SE* 17 (1943): 187-224; see above, p. 283, n. 11. Kyle Meredith Philipps thinks he is able to recognize the triad Jupiter-Juno-Minerva on a terra-cotta (sixth century B.C.), found by him in 1967 in Poggio Civitate, "Bryn Mawr College Excavations in Tuscany, 1967," *AJA* 72 (1968): 120-24, and pls. 45-52; "Poggio Civitate," *Archaeology* 21 (1968): 252-61 (esp. 255-56 and 259). It is surely an illusion. There is probably not even a question of gods, and there are four figures, not three, a male with his male servant, a female with her female servant. Nor are the other figures on the terra-cotta an Etruscan version of the "infernal triad," prefiguring the Roman triad Ceres-Liber-Libera.

140. "Contributo allo studio dell'arce etrusca di Marzabotto" in *Atti e Memorie della Deputazione di Storia Patria per la Romagna* (1923), p. 69; *Etruria antica* 1 (1927): 97-101 (p. 101, on the Cretan sanctuaries with three chambers); *Le problème étrusque* (1938), pp. 150-51 (in the Greek world: the triple temple of Aphrodite at Paphos, in Cyprus; that of Perachora, in the Isthmus of Corinth; and of course the temple of the Phokikon which was discussed above, pp. 306-7); cf. above, p. 285, n. 1.

("consensione"), to whom a *Vulcanus Jouialis* is added with a particular distinction, "although he never leaves his celestial sojourn"; (2) the eleven deities who, in association with Jupiter, constitute the Greek group of the "Twelve Great Gods" (Juno, Vesta, etc.); (3) seven *residui*, whose names are not given; (4) gods who are shared among the sixteen regions, a number of whom having double residences; (5) the *dii Azoni*, those who apparently have no regular domicile in any of these sixteen regions.¹⁴¹

The first group reminds us of the two councils which assist Jupiter in the theory of the thunderbolts, and Weinstock explains the presence of Vulcanus here by the assimilation of that god to the Sun in certain well-known speculations. It may be thought that the Twelve and the Seven owe at least their number to astrological representations (the zodiac, the planets). But it is the gods of the sixteen regions who are the most likely to retain something of an authentic Etruscan tradition. Here is the list (45-60):

- I. "Post ipsum Jouem": *dii Consentes Penates, Salus ac Lares, Janus, Fauores opertanei Nocturnusque.*
- II. "Praeter domum Jouis, quae ibi quoque sublimis est, ut est in omnibus praediatus": *Quirinus Mars, Lars militaris; Juno, Fons, Lymphae, dii Nouensides.*
- III. *Juppiter Secundanus, Jouis Opulentia, Minerua; Discordia ac Seditio; Pluto.*
- IV. *Lynsa siluestris, Mulciber, Lar caelestis, Lar militaris, Fauor.*
- V. *Coniuges reges Ceres Tellurus Terraeque pater, Vulcanus et Genius.*
- VI. *Jouis filii Pales et Fauor, Celeritas Solis filia, Mars Quirinus, Genius.*
- VII. *Liber, Pales Secundanus, Fraus.*
- VIII. *Veris fructus (et aliqui superius corrogati).*
- IX. *Junonis Hospitae Genius.*
- X. *Neptunus, Lar omnium cunctalis, Neuerita, Consus.*
- XI. *Fortuna, Valetudo, Fauor pastor, Manes.*
- XII. *Sancus.*
- XIII. *Fata, ceteri di Manium.*
- XIV. *Saturnus, Saturni caelestis Juno.*
- XV. *Veiovis, Di publici.*
- XVI. *Nocturnus, Janitores terrestres.*

141. Piganiol, "Les Etrusques, peuple d'Orient" (see above, n. 7), pp. 343-44, thinks that this classification is very close to the theology of the Chaldeans as given by Diod. Sic. 2.30.6: (1) five planets called *έρμηνεῖς*, interpreters of the divine will; (2) thirty stars called advisory gods, *βουλαῖοι θεοί*; (3) twelve gods, powerful among the gods, *τῶν θεῶν κύριοι*; (4) twenty-four stars outside of the zodiac, the supreme judges, *δικασταὶ τῶν ὅλων*.

This list has been examined in two very fine monographs, which are separated by an interval of forty years, one by Carl Thulin, *Die Götter des Martianus Capella und der Bronzeleber von Piacenza*, RVV 3, 1 (1906); the other by Stefan Weinstock, "Martianus Capella and the Cosmic System of the Etruscans," *JRS* 36 (1946): 101-29. They have scrupulously investigated the part taken from Hellenistic astrology, which was indicated earlier by A. Bouché-Leclercq¹⁴² and which has turned out to be very considerable. Moreover, the second exegete has shown the characteristic stamp of Greek and Eastern speculations concerning the right and left and the top and bottom in connection with the divisions of the sky. Finally, they have explored every possible way of reconciling Martianus Capella with the other two documents, the liver and the theory of the thunderbolts. What are the results of all this excellent work?

It no longer seems possible to do what Thulin hoped for, namely, to establish a correspondence between the inhabitants of the liver's sixteen compartments and those of Martianus Capella's sixteen *regiones*, no matter what starting point on the border of the liver is adopted. The two documents have three features in common: (1) the number of divisions and the principle of the distribution of the gods; (2) the fact that "Jupiter" is present in three *regiones* (adjoining, I, II, III) and, either as *Tin(ia)* or as *Vetis-I*, in three compartments (2, 3, 16; which would be adjoining without the intercalation of 1, reserved for the *Cilensl*, "Penates"?); (3) the fact that *Ani* and *Uni* are housed, if not in the same compartments as *Tin(ia)*, at least in the ones closest to him, while *Janus* and *Juno* are respectively associated with *Jupiter* in the first and second *regiones*. Beyond these points of agreement, which are by no means strictly established, everything that has been suggested is uncertain.

For the sake of an example, and because these are assuredly the most important, here is what can be said about the inhabitants of the first three *regiones*, those of Jupiter (I, II) or of a Jupiter supplied with an uninterpretable epithet, *Secundanus* (III):

Region I. (1) First of all, it holds Jupiter; (2) to Jupiter are added

¹⁴². *Histoire de la divination* 4: 25-26 (comparison of the sixteen regions with the houses, places, and lots of astrology); *L'astrologie grecque* (1899), p. 279 (the sixteen regions and the *octatropos*).

the two divine colleges which appear in the theory of the thunderbolts, but divided (thunderbolts 2 and 3) and not, as here, combined (Region I): *Di Consentēs* and *Fauores Opertanei*—the latter, whatever may have been the reason for translating the substantive by *Fauores*, having a characteristic epithet (“covered” or “hidden”) equivalent to that of the *Dii Superiores et Inuoluti* (“veiled”); *Penates* belongs to the same group: the Roman scholars sometimes used this Latin name as a translation or gloss for the Etruscan names of the two colleges; (3) *Lares* has been explained by Weinstock as “demons of the house” of Jupiter,¹⁴³ for whom Region I would be the ideal dwelling; he thinks that *Salus* can be explained in the same terms; but this Entity may have a more general meaning; (4) *Janus* is here in his quality as god of all beginnings; (5) *Nocturnus* may represent the north, the cardinal point from which the whole orientation starts.¹⁴⁴ To sum up, the inhabitants of the region consist of two types of god: first of all, Jupiter and his advisers (I, 2), who are the essential elements, and gods connected with the location (3), the rank (4), and the orientation (5) of the region.

Regions II and III are closely attached to Region I, not only through the presence of Jupiter, but through the distribution in them of the terms of the two divine triads of Rome, the Capitoline triad (*Juppiter* I, II, III; *Juno* II; *Minerua* III) and also the pre-Capitoline triad (*Juppiter* I, II, III; *Quirinus Mars* II, with Quirinus evidently being regarded, as he often was during the last years of the Republic, as only a doublet, and here even as a kind of nickname, of Mars). Weinstock (pp. 107–8) believes that Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva are mentioned by reason of their Stoic interpretation as the ether, the air, and the moon (Arn. 3.30–31); he also believes (p. 103) that Mars and *Lars militaris* are adequately explained in II by the analogy of the astrological system of *sortes* (Manilius, *Astronomica* 3.102), the second term of which is *militia*. With respect to this last proposition, it may be

143. Weinstock, “Martianus Capella . . .,” *JRS* 36 (1946): 109, n. 45: Jupiter’s house with its domestic cults is also described by Ovid, *Met.* 1.170–76.

144. Weinstock, p. 104, recognizes the indication of three out of the four cardinal points in the system of the *regiones*: Nocturnus in I and XVI (north); Vulcanus (here equivalent to the Sun) in IV (Mulciber) and V (east); Manes in XI and XIII and also Sancus (that is, *Semo*, regarded as a *semideus*) in XII (west); Thulin, *Die Götter des Martianus Capella*, p. 165, thought that the cardinal points were marked by Nocturnus (N), Celeritas Jouis filia (E), Veris fructus (S), and Saturnus (W). On Nocturnus, see Z. Stewart, “The God Nocturnus in Plautus’ *Amphitruo*,” *JRS* 50 (1960): 37–43 (pp. 41–42: Martianus Capella).

objected that the list of the *regiones* corresponds in only a few terms (three out of twelve, if this one is allowed) to the list of the twelve *sortes*; and, with respect to the whole, that it is peculiar that just the two Roman triads should be conjointly mentioned, for different and extra-Roman reasons. It may also be remarked that the association of Quirinus with Mars can be understood better if Martianus was thinking of the pre-Capitoline triad.

But there is still more. Some years ago I noted¹⁴⁵ that the first three *regiones caeli*, which clearly form a unit, are also distributed throughout the system of the three functions, which belonged to all the Italic peoples, especially the Umbrians, before it belonged to earliest Rome and before it was expressed in the pre-Capitoline triad, a triad which is present here but with a third term (Quirinus) devoid of its proper significance and identified with the second (Mars): after Region I, in which Jupiter is shown, along with his advisers, in the sacred government of the world, Region II places next to him the warlike function (Quirinus-Mars, *Lars militaris*), and Region III wealth (*Jouis Opulentia*). Thus we find the reconstitution of something very close to the theology of the Roman Regia, in which what is essentially the domain of Jupiter (along with Janus and Juno) harbors a chapel of Mars and a chapel of Ops. Weinstock (p. 109) writes: "unexplained: *Iovis Opulentia*." On the contrary, such an entity can be explained very well in this grouping. Personally I believe that Martianus is here following an authentic classification which the Etruscans may have borrowed from the Italic peoples at the time of their arrival on the peninsula. This interpretation allows us to account more easily for several other elements in the peopling of Regions II and III.

Region II. Jupiter, the warrior gods, and Juno are explained well enough by the "triads." Martianus very probably understood *Nouensides* in the meaning of "the nine gods"—which must refer to the nine divinities who hurl the thunderbolt; thus Jupiter is here considered not in his aspect as sovereign, surrounded by his councils, but as god of the lightning, as meteorological god, along with the other fulgurant gods. This is thoroughly consistent with the mention

145. "Remarques sur les trois premières *regiones caeli* de Martianus Capella," *Lat.* 23 (1956): 102-7.

of war on the one hand, and of waters (cf. Jupiter *Elicius*) on the other. To justify the presence of the waters, Weinstock assumes an earlier version in which Jupiter (I, II, III), Neptune (II), and Pluto (III) appeared, and from which Neptune was later transferred to X, though not without leaving behind him his "small change," *Fons* and *Lymphae*. This is not probable: Martianus had no scruples about lodging a single god in several *regiones* at the same time (Genius in V and VI, Mars Quirinus in II and VI, Pales in VI and VII), and the introduction of Neptune into X did not have to entail his suppression in II; moreover, we shall see that Pluto can be explained in III without this hypothesis.

Region III. Jupiter Secundanus, Jouis Opulentia, and Minerva are justified by the triads. It will be noted that if the epithet *Secundanus* refers, as some people think, to the *secunda*, *secundae res*, to prosperity, then this specification of Jupiter in the "third function" is appropriate. Still in the perspective of the "third function," Pluto is not out of place: fertility and prosperity have everywhere close and manifold connections with the subterranean world, with the underground. As for Discordia and Seditio, who Weinstock sees as the natural "associates" of Pluto, I prefer to see in them the too common areas of activity of the "little people," of this "plebs," which is to the third function what the *senatores* are to the first and the *milites* to the second.

Beyond Region III, Weinstock's propositions are certainly ingenious, and sometimes alluring, but they do not carry conviction: one has to admit ignorance.

If it is not possible to push the exegesis of Martianus Capella's list any farther, then with even greater reason we are without a clue to the meaning of most of the forty labels on the liver of Piacenza. Contrary to most authors, I have proposed to dissociate the border—which is only comparable, with its sixteen compartments, to the sixteen regions of Martianus—from the two lobes, and to regard the left lobe (with the wheel) as terrestrial ("the present world"), and the right lobe (with the gridwork) as celestial ("the other world"). At least this accounts for some facts: of the gods of the wheel, those which can be interpreted are *Cilen* in 35 (which apparently has to be translated as *Penates*); *Selva* in 36, and *Satres* in 40; now one of the four

varieties of "Etruscan Penates"¹⁴⁶ is directly concerned with man, as are the Roman Penates, while Silvanus and Saturnus are gods closely connected with the soil; inversely, none of the great "celestial" gods of the border appears in the wheel. By contrast, the gridwork mentions *Tin(ia)* twice, in 17 and 19; while *Θvf* in 19 and *Θuflθas* in 18 must, like *Θvf* on the border (in 3), designate one of the great councils of Jupiter (the other being *Tin(ia) Cilen*, "Jouis Penates?" in 2, and *Cilens-l* in 1).

THE WORLD OF THE DEAD

If the study of religious ideas is not replaced by an archaeological survey or by the history of the art, as is usually done, there is very little to say about Etruscan beliefs concerning the afterlife. A. Grenier has well expressed the uncertainty in which we are left, despite a considerable mass of monuments and representational documents:

The most significant documents are the paintings which decorate the walls of the funeral chambers. But their interpretation raises a number of problems. Consider, for example, during the archaic era (sixth and fifth centuries), the scenes of the hunt or of returns from the hunt. What relation do they have with life beyond the grave? Are they the expression of hopes for the other life, or memories dear to the deceased, or, even more simply, a decoration of the grave analogous to that in the richest dwellings of the living? Do the monsters of earth and sea which are portrayed there inhabit the underworld or are they only decorative motifs borrowed from Greek art? Do the scenes of banquets, the dances, the music, and the games of every kind take place in the nether world or on earth? Are they something else than the representation of the ceremonies which accompanied the funeral rites? Are they intended to prolong the benefit of those ceremonies for the dead man, for as long as the paintings shall last? . . . Later, starting with the fourth century, the scenes painted on the walls of the graves are localized in the underworld, but their meaning is not always clear.¹⁴⁷

146. It is not known what place in the theology was occupied by the theory of the four species of Penates, Arn. *Gent.* 3.40: *idem* [Nigidius] *rursus in libro sexto exponit et decimo, disciplinas etruscas sequens, genera esse Penatum quattuor et esse Jouis ex his alios, alios Neptuni, inferorum tertios, mortalium hominum quartos, inexplicabile nescio quid dicens.*

147. *La religion étrusque*, pp. 54-55.

The uncertainty is even greater than this. It is commonly agreed that the Etruscans, who as a general rule practiced inhumation rather than cremation, originally believed that their dead went on living in the graves themselves; does this not explain the veritable funeral houses, often sumptuously furnished, which, from the eighth century on, received the bodies? The chambers in which they rested opened on a corridor, or surrounded an atrium, like those of the town houses, and they were filled with plenty of furniture and with costly household utensils. Later, starting in the fourth century, the mural paintings¹⁴⁸ represent, beyond any doubt, the nether world, which is different from that of Greece but inspired by it. The dead man travels, either on horseback or in a chariot; he is welcomed to the other world by a group of men who may be his ancestors; a banquet awaits him, presided over by Hades and Persephone, who are here called *Eita* and *fersipnai*. Is not this the token of a radical change in the conception of the life *post mortem*? Instead of eternal imprisonment in a grave which had been made as attractive and comfortable as possible, an abode in the country of the dead was envisaged, to which the tomb is no more than the symbolic gateway . . . Matters are not quite so simple. In speaking of Rome,¹⁴⁹ we recalled a universal feature of the representations relating to death, the dead, and their fate: the ease with which men, even the most highly civilized men, consent to live in a state of contradiction or incoherence in this respect. Moreover, the Etruscans were able to imagine the other world very well before they could portray it; they were also able to fill the graves with domestic objects and yet to imagine that the soul was embarking on a long voyage, at the end of which it would find them again, them or their like.

What makes it likely that the country of the dead is an ancient idea in Etruria is the fact that in the era when the artists began to depict it regularly on the walls of the graves, definitely under Greek influence and with numerous Greek elements, they nevertheless introduced into their paintings persons and episodes which are not themselves Greek. In particular they set up a demonology, at once fantastic and realistic, which their models from beyond the Adriatic did not furnish them with and which they certainly did not

148. See the bibliography of the tomb paintings, below, p. 696.

149. See above, pp. 63-64, 363-65, 367-68.

invent.¹⁵⁰ Probably they received it from the popular imagination, from folklore, rather than from a strictly religious doctrine.¹⁵¹

The most original of these personages of the beyond has nothing Greek about him but his name, *Charun* (*χάρυν*). How different he is from the pallid official whose civil status he has usurped:

*Le nocher qui m'a pris l'obole du passage
Et qui jamais ne parle aux ombres qu'il conduit . . .*

Charun is the very spirit of death. He is not handsome: according to his best portraitist, "if his hooked nose reminds one of a bird of prey and his ears of a horse, his gnashing teeth, on the monuments where the cruel grin of his lips reveals them, evoke the image of a carnivorous animal, ready to devour his victims."¹⁵² While the other demons are painted in brown, like the men, his flesh is a dark blue, or greenish.¹⁵³ Whereas he seldom is shown with Charon's oar, he regularly has a mallet as his attribute,¹⁵⁴ and frequently his head, his shoulders, or his girdle are adorned with serpents.¹⁵⁵ Such a description gives ample notice of his function: he rushes upon those—the Trojan captives, Troilos, Oinomaos—whose death or murder is imminent;¹⁵⁶ the mallet can have only one meaning, and it is certainly the meaning shown in a few late monuments: Charun knocks the mortal whose hour has come on the head.¹⁵⁷ Then, as a kind of psychopomp, he accompanies him in the voyage, on foot or on horseback, which takes him away from his familiar world.¹⁵⁸ The trip is by no means a restful one: a famous portrayal shows a dense throng of demons and musicians surrounding the deceased, whom a huge Charun clutches in his talons.¹⁵⁹

150. S. Weinstock, "Etruscan Demons," *Studi in onore di Luisa Banti* (1965), pp. 345–60: a passage from Porphyry, not utilized until the present, attributes to the Etruscans visible, sometimes corporeal demons, who were capable of suffering, ejaculating sperm, burning and leaving ashes, etc.

151. On the Orphic influences which some have claimed to recognize in certain of the paintings, see above, n. 94.

152. F. de Ruyt, *Charun, démon étrusque de la mort* (1934), pp. 146–47.

153. *Ibid.*, p. 147, where references to the paintings will be found.

154. *Ibid.*, p. 142.

155. *Ibid.*, p. 152.

156. *Ibid.*, p. 195.

157. *Ibid.*, p. 202.

158. *Ibid.*, p. 198.

159. *Ibid.*

In this area Charun is not the only creation of the Etruscan spirit: there are raging Furies, bearing unexplained names such as *Culśu* and *Vanθ*,¹⁶⁰ one of whom is as it were his female double. An anonymous male demon with regular features, "younger and more agreeable, assists the demon of death in his duties, acting as a kind of foil to him";¹⁶¹ in contrast, another demon succeeds in being even more monstrous and more bestial than Charun. His name is *Tuxulxa*; "he has the long beak of a bird of prey set in the middle of his face, long ears, no lips, an enormous tongue, and two great serpents wound around his head."¹⁶²

Contrary to other interpretations, F. de Ruyt emphasizes¹⁶³ that these frightful creatures do not play any role in the life hereafter, that they do not act as implacable tormentors of their victim throughout eternity, and do not devote themselves to hellish works: "Charun's role, like that of the Furies, begins at the moment of death and ends with the entry into the underworld." In other words, their company is only an evil moment to be endured, after which, thanks to the scenes of banquets, games,¹⁶⁴ and hunting which counterbalance these unpleasant processions on the walls of the tombs, we are free to imagine an eternity of pleasures under a Persephone and a Hades whose headgear is a wolf's head—probably another legacy from native folklore—which, however, is not enough to make him seem forbidding.¹⁶⁵

In these underworld scenes a book or a scroll is often shown. Usually it is a demon who holds it or is about to write in it, but it also appears in the hands of the dead man himself, and perhaps once in the hands of the dead man's relatives.¹⁶⁶ There is nothing to suggest that it is a question of a "balance sheet of his actions," intended for a

160. *Ibid.*, pp. 204–15; R. Enking, "Culśu und Vanθ," *RM* 58 (1943): 48–69.

161. De Ruyt, pp. 217–18.

162. *Ibid.*, pp. 218–20; cf. pp. 11–12 (in the second chamber of the tomb called "dell' Orco" at Tarquinii).

163. *Ibid.*, pp. 224–29.

164. On the portrayals of games, and on the character of the *φersu*, see above, pp. 574–75.

165. De Ruyt, p. 153; the tradition, says de Ruyt, so firmly maintained is that Dante, *Inferno* 7. 8, calls Pluto "maledetto lupo" and a drawing by Michelangelo portrays Pluto with a wolf's head. Cf. J. Gagé, "Les Etrusques dans l'Énéide," *MEFR* 46 (1929): 135–36 (explaining *Aen.* 11.676–82, *caput ingens oris hiatus/et malae texere lupi cum dentibus altis*, by a demon in a fresco from Corneto whose head is clamped between the jaws of a wolf), and my own "Propertiana 3 ('Lycomedius' et 'galeritus Lygmon,' *Prop.* 4, 2, 51 et 1, 34)," *Lat.* 10 (1951): 296–99.

166. De Ruyt, pp. 154–62.

tribunal or for a judgment. When a few characters in the book are deciphered, they turn out to be merely the name of the deceased and, in Roman numerals, his age. Thus the *uolumen* is "a kind of passport to the hereafter."¹⁶⁷

These sporadic indications concerning properly Etruscan beliefs are inadequate to permit a useful search for their origins. The comparisons which F. de Ruyt makes, at the end of his fine book (p. 217), with the lesser demons of the Assyro-Babylonian religion do not establish a relationship: the same kind of creatures can be found inhabiting the hells of India or China, not to mention those of our own Middle Ages. As the learned author himself says, "human nature hardly changes in the course of the ages; nor do man's psychological reactions, but only their external manifestation, determined by the contingencies of the moment and the evolution of ideas. Charun, the Etruscan demon of death, is one aspect, *hic et nunc*, of human beings' reactions when they are confronted with the disturbing mystery which unavoidably engulfs this no less strange and unseizable property: life" (p. 254).

SELECTED WORKS ON ETRUSCAN RELIGION

Of the many books which deal with the Etruscans, and which devote all or several chapters to religion, I can cite only a few: P. Ducati, *Etruria antica*, 2 vols. (1927), and *Le problème étrusque* (1938); M. Pallottino, *Etruscologia*, often revised; the sixth edition (1968) has 476 pages, as against 298 in the first (1942); M. Renard, *Initiation à l'étruscologie* (1943); R. Bloch, *Les Etrusques* (1954); A. Hus, *Les Etrusques* (1961); cf. J. Heurgon, *La vie quotidienne chez les Etrusques* (1961). Of the older books, K. O. Müller and W. Deecke, *Die Etrusker*, 2 vols. (1877), is still valuable.

On the religion: C. Clemen, *Die Religion der Etrusker* (1936); G. Q. Giglioli, "La religione degli Etruschi," in *Storia delle religioni*, ed.

167. *Ibid.*, p. 160. On these *uolumina*, see F. Messerschmidt, "Die schreibenden Gottheiten in der etruskischen Religion," *ARW* 29 (1931): 60-69; C. Kerényi, "Sul significato dei libri nei monumenti sepolcrali etruschi," *SE* 9 (1935): 421-22 (against G. Herbig's interpretation, "propinqui superstites cum libellis").

P. Tacchi Venturi (1947), pp. 769-849; A. Grenier, "La religion étrusque," *Mana* 2, 3 (1948): 3-79; R. Herbig, "Zur Religion und Religiosität der Etrusker," *Historia* 6 (1957): 123-32.

The fundamental review, *Studi Etruschi* (later *St. Etr. ed Italici*) has been published at Florence since 1927, in yearly volumes (except in difficult times). The articles in the *RE* relating to the Etruscans are of high quality (G. Körte, F. Skutsch, C. Thulin, and others).

From the Greek and Latin literary sources, the passages in which the words *Tuscus*, *Etruscus*, etc., are explicitly written have been collected in C. Clemen, *Fontes historiae religionum* 6 (1936): 27-57.

The *Corpus Inscriptionum Etruscarum* (I; II 1, 2, 3; Supplement: the fillets of Agram) has been published since 1893 (ed. C. Pauli, A. O. Danielsson; later E. Sittig, G. Herbig). A judicious choice of texts, with a lexicon, is given in M. Pallottino, *Testimonia linguae Etruscae* (1954). From 1908 to 1922, E. Lattes edited great indexes (phonetic, morphological, and lexical) in the *Rendiconti del Reale Istituto Lombardo* and in the *Memorie della R. Accademia di Napoli*. The names of Etruscan persons and their Latin derivatives have been treated, not without a touch of Etruscomania, in W. Schulze, "Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen," *AGWG* 7, pt. 4 (1904).

The illustrations on the mirrors have been published by E. Gerhard, *Etruskische Spiegel*, 4 vols. (1841-62), with a fifth volume (1896) by A. Klügmann and G. Körte; frequent complements are given in C. A. Mansuelli's reports in *SE*. The figurations of the funerary urns are in E. Brunn, and later G. Körte, *I rilievi delle urne etrusche*, 3 vols. (1870-1916). Pending a corpus of the paintings, we have available F. Weege, *Etruskische Malerei* (1921); F. Poulsen, *Etruscan Tomb Paintings* (1922); M. Pallottino, *La peinture étrusque* (1952); M. Moretti, *Nuovi monumenti di pittura etrusca*, vol. 1 (1966) (new frescoes, discovered ten years earlier by Lerici and his team, thanks to new techniques of prospecting). See also Maria Santangelo, *Musei e monumenti Etruschi* (Istituto geografico de Agostini, Novara, 1960) and Emeline Richardson, *The Etruscans: Their Art and Civilization* (Chicago, 1964).

INDEX

The index is subdivided as follows: Rome / 697; Italy / 708; Greece and the Near East / 710; India / 710; Iran / 711; The Germanic Peoples / 712; The Celtic Peoples / 712; The Hittites / 712; The Ossetes / 712; The Káfirs / 712; The Circassian Peoples / 712; Varia / 712; Index to the Appendix / 712; Principal Texts Discussed / 714

ROME

Adolenda, 35

aedituus, 57, 593 n. 42

Aeneas, 44, 95 n. 6; myth of Vinalia, 185, 472; Palladium, 306; introduction of legend into Italy, 310 n. 30, 452-53; Penates, 355; Venus, 452-54; Lar Aineias, 453, 500 n. 5; First Punic War, 454; Second Punic War, 463-70; Magna Mater, 484-92; demigod, 505; Caesar, 545-46

Aesculapius, 443-44, 451

Agonenses (Salii), 147

agonium: of 9 January, 172-73, 330; of 17 March, 213; of 11 December, 563

Aius Locutius, 39, 43-46

alites, 598

Allia: site, 42; day, 564

altaria, 314

Ambarvalia, 229-30

amburbium, 230

amiculum Junonis, 294

ancilia, 146, 214; *see also* Mamurius Veturius; Salii

Angerona (*Diua*), -alia, 335-37

Anna Perenna, 212-13, 305-6, 334

Anteuorta (Carmentis), 393

Antistius Labeo, 101, 668

Apollo, 441-43; *medicus*, 479-80; and Sulla, 538-39; Apollinar(e), 442, 448; *see also under* "Greece and the Near East": Apollo; Delphi

aquaelicism, 178 n. 2

ara, 314-15, 578-79; A. Maxima, 433-37; *a. Martis in Campo*, 206; *a. Volupiae*, 335-36; *a. Fontis*, 388

arculum, *inarculum*, 152 n. 8

Argei, -a, 449-50

Aruale (*carmen*), 229-30, 592 n. 40

Aruales (*fratres*): Adolenda, etc., 35; *carmen Aruale*, 229-30; sons of Larentia, 269 n. 34; Flora, 270; 592

asses: Consualia, 278; Vestalia, 219 n. 21, 324

Ateius Capito, 101

Athenion, 529

Attalus, 484

Attus Navius: vocation, 128; and Tarquin, 188-89

Aventine: population, 8; Juno Regina, 298, 426; Vortumnus, 339; Diana, 407-8 and n. 2; Ceres, 378-79; procession of 207, 481-82

Auerruncus, 232

augmenta, 558

- augurium*: *a. salutis*, *a. canarium*, *a.* and *auspiciu*, 595-96; private *a.*, 618
 augurs, 92, 179, 188-89, 193-94, 451, 537, 594-600; *see also* Attus Navius
augustus, 118 (and n. 1)-19, 130-31, 510
 Aurelii and Sol, 432, 621
auspiciu, -ia: defense against and tricks to evade, 119-23; plebeian consulate, 192; L. Papirius Cursor, 196-97; Sulla, 537-38; peculiar to Gabii, 595; and *augurium*, 595-96; 597-600; *see also iuge(s) auspiciu*
 Bacchus, Bacchanalia, 515-21; *senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus*, 91, 391, 520-21
 Bataces, 535
 Bellona: formula of *deuotio*, 93; and Mars, 241; 390-92
 Bona Dea, 350
 bull, 559 n. 13; *see also suouetaurilia*
 Caca, 43 n. 10
 Cacus, 43 n. 10, 433
 Caeculus, 253, 255; and L. Caecilius Metellus, 325-26
 Caesar: Lupercalia, 349-50; 542-49
calatores: of augurs, 85-88, 594; of major flamens, 108 n. 4; of pontiffs and major flamens, 587
 calendar, 113-14, 559-65
 Calends: Janus, 173, 180-81; of January: taking of office by consuls, 287; of March: *femineae Cal.*, 294-95; Juno, 295; Janus, 330; Janus and Juno, 334; *see also faba*; Tigillum Sororium
 calves, 221, 223-24 and n. 24, 373, 383
 camilli, -ae, 593 n. 42
 Campus Martius: origin, 155; *ara*, *templum Martis*, 206; *Equus October*, 217; agrarian Mars, 227 n. 35; temple of Neptunus, 389; temple of Bellona, 391; temple of Feronia, 414-15; temple of Hercules and Muses, 438; *ludi Tarentini*, Tarentum, 444-45
campus sceleratus, 587
 Capitol, temple of Jupiter: St. Augustine, 99; and plebeians, 196 n. 29; ceremony under Vespasian, 238-39, 665; original, 283-86; meaning for Rome of *templum Capitolinum*, 287-88; triumphant general at, 288; 547; Scipio, 506; *see also caput humanum*; Jupiter; *ludi*
 Capitoline triad, 239, 283-310; predominance of Jupiter, 290; and triad of Phôkikon, 306-7; possible Etruscan origin, 307; meaning for "Tarquins" and adapted for Romans, 307-9, 308 n. 29; after Trebia, 463-64
Capitolium uetus, 306 and n. 26
caput humanum of Capitol, 41-42, 191, 308, 499; *c. equi*, *bouis* at Carthage, 465-69
 Cara cognatio, Caristia, 405-6, 617
 Cardea: Carna, 385; 614
 Carmentis, -ta, 108, 392-94; -tes, 383 n. 21, 393; -talia, 563
 Carna, 385-87; -aria, 386
 Ca(s)menae: *lucus* of, 388, 410; Muses, 455
 Castor, -res, 412-14; Fontei, 432; *see also under "Greece and the Near East": Dioscuri*
 Cato the Elder: slaves, 418; 493-95; rural religion, 612-13; Cato of Utica, 533
 Ceres: and Vervactor, etc., 35; before Sentinum, 89, 194, 250; and plebs, 195, 379-80; and Flora, 270; and Tellus, 370; etymology, 374-75; and Demeter, 375; Cerialia, 375-76, 380 and n. 18; and sow, 375-77; and *mundus*, 377; and Liber, Libera, 378, 448; temple on Aventine, 378-79; *initia Cereris*, 380; Cerialia canceled after Cannae, 478; in private cult, 613-14
cerritus, 368
cerus, 331, 375
 Chaldaei, 525, 620
 chickens, *see pullarius*
 Cicero: *numen*, 29; Furrina, 47; *iuge(s) auspiciu*, 85-88; Cato, 495; *Somnium Scipionis*, 507; Cotta, 509; 549-50
 Cinxia, 19
 circumambulation, 229-30
 Circus Flaminius, 573
 Circus Maximus: agrarian cults, 157 n.

- Circus Maximus—(cont.)
 15, 573; Hercules, 433; *templum Herculis Pompeiani*, 438; temple of Mercury, 440; *pompa Circensis*, 572
 civil wars and religion, 530–36; and murder of Remus, 531–32
Clementia Caesaris, 547
 Cocles, Horatius: statue struck by lightning, 321, 606; and Scaevola, 75, 380 n. 17
 Coinquenda, 35
collegium artificum, fabrum: Carnaria, 386; Juturna, 388; 622 and n. 13; c. *pontificum*, 269 n. 35, 585 n. 16; four great colleges, 588
Columna Bellica, 391
comitia calata, 622; c. *centuriata, curiata*, 260–61; c. *sacerdotum*, 588
 Commolenda, 35
communicatio sacrorum, 430, 436
compitum, Compitalia, 343, 618; *see also* Lares
comprecationes deorum, 161, 207, 271, 398
 Concordia, 400–406
confarreatio: major flamens, 107, 111, 153; Jupiter Farreus, 182; 615
conlucare (lucum), 614
 Consus, Consualia, 156–58, 267–68, 277, 573; *see also* Ops; Quirinus
contactus, 22
 cow: *Fordicidia*, 371–74; and Pales, 382; 411
 Crane, *see* Carna
 Curiatii, and Horatii, 75 and n. 21
Curtius (lacus), 192, 351
 Damia, 350
daps: offered to Jupiter, Ceres, 182–83; offered to Pales, 383–84; *dapalis* (*see* Jupiter)
 Dea Dia, 35, 407
decemviri: *sacris faciundis*, 125–26, 442, 444; during Second Punic War, 460, 462, 470, 479, 482–83; *duumviri, quindecimviri*, 604–5
dedicatio, 556
deditio, 427–28
 Deferunda, 35 and n. 3
delubrum, 319
denicales (feriae), 617
detestatio sacrorum, 622
deuotio: *contactus*, 22; formula of, 93–96; Jupiter-Mars-Quirinus, 143–44, 163–66; javelin, 238; Volcanus, 320
deus: Indo-European word, 30; *dii certi*, 399 n. 3; *dii parentum*, 365; *see also* *Indigetes* and *Nouensiles*; *sive deus*...
 Diana: gods of Titus Tatius, 169–70; 407–12; *diania*, 410
dies: *festi profesti, fasti nefasti*, 560–61, 563–64; d. *atri*, 564; d. *comitiales*, 352, 563; d. *fissi, intercisi*, 564; d. *natalis*, 360, 612; d. *lustricus*, 616; d. *Alliensis*, 564; d. *servorum*, 411
 Dis, 444–45
 Divalia (Angeronalia), 335
diuinatio, 127, 594–610
 Dius Fidius: oaths, thunderbolts, 180, 198–200; *see also* Fides; Jupiter
do dico addico, 122, 131 n. 8
do ut des, 124, 421
 dog: Robigalia, 158; and Lares Praestites, 344; Lupercalia, 348
dominia, 488
duumviri, 125–26, 442, 604; *see also* *decemviri*
 Ecurria, 206, 562, 565
 Egeria, 145, 372, 408 and n. 5, 410
 Ennius, 490–92, 497, 500–501
 ensigns, 236 n. 49
epulones (triumviri), 588; *epulones dii* (“feasting gods”), 99; Jupiter Epulo, 183
epulum Jouis, 113, 183, 196, 311, 483, 567
Equus October, 17, 154–55 and n. 12; discussion of “agrarian” Mars, 215–24; and *asvamedha*, 224–27; and Mars, 278; *see also* Parilia
 Esquiline: geopolitics, 65; Juno Regina, 295; Tellus, 371; Honos and Virtus, 400
 Eunus, 529
 Evander, 392, 452
evocatio: Minerva of Falerii not summoned forth, 304–5; 424–27; Juno of Veii, 426–27; Juno of Carthage, 448, 469; risks of, 509 n. 18; Sulla and

euocatio—(cont.)

Apollo, 538; *uotum*, 555–56

excantatio, 425

exoratio of Juno of Carthage, 469–70

faba: Lemuralia, 367; Parilia, 383–84;

Carna, *Calendae fabariae*, 385

Falacer, 104, 108

fas: etymology, fetials, 91, 131–32, 589;

fas fastus nefastus, 560–61; *si fas est* . . . ,

596–97; Q.R.C.F(as), 447, 564;

Q.ST.D.F(as), 317, 564

fatum, 197, 457, 499–504; three *fata* of Aen. VI–XII, 501

Fauna, 43 n. 10, 350

Faunus, 344–46; Fatuus, Fatuclus, 345;

Lupercalia, 349–50; Fordicidia, 372;

Feronia, 418

Febris, 230 n. 40

februa, -are, -arius, -us, 347–48; etymology, 349 n. 33; *Februarius consul*, 215

felicitas, *Felicitas*: Sulla, 533, 540 and n. 13; Pompey, 542

Feralia, 366, 617

ferctum, 153

feriae: *publicae*, *priuateae*, 559–65; *f. denicales*, 617; *f. familiares*, 616; *f. Latinae*, 204, 463

feriatus, -a: *flamen Dialis*, 151–52; *flaminica Dialis*, 152

Feronia, 414–21; after Trebia, 462

Fesson(i)a, 335

Festus, S. Pompeius, 97

fetials: formulas, 42, 91–93; and *fas*, 91; ruse of Postumius, 123; Jupiter Lapis, Feretrius, 179–80; *indictio belli*, 208–9; Rome-Carthage treaty, 273–74; *Columnna Bellica*, 391; 590–93

Fides: three major flamens, 144–46, 280; Numa, 198–99; temple of, 397, 400; and Concordia, 401; *Fides publica*, 199; see also *Dius Fidius*; Jupiter; Numa

fines, 91

fire: birth by, Rome, Praeneste, India, 56; three fires, 311–22; fires of Parilia, 383; see also *Vesta*; *Volcanus*

flamen, -ines, -onium: neuter form, 81,

92; *flamen-brahman*, 211, 580 n. 7; major flamens in “pontifical revolution,” 103; list of minor flamens, 104; two classifications, gods without flamens, 105–6; major and minor flamens, 106–8; major flamens in *ordo sacerdotum*, 141–43; sacrifice by major flamens to Fides, 144–46; status and duties of major flamens, 151–61; nature of *flamonium*, 580–82; major flamens and *rex sacrorum*, 582

flamen Cerialis, 375

flamen Dialis, 151–53; not *uates*, 127–28; in summer *Vinalia*, 185; Caesar, 543; no *flamen Dialis* in closing years of Republic, 549; *quotidie feriatus*, 561, 577

flamen Floralis, 270

flamen Martialis, 154–56; and *Equus October*, 155 n. 13, 218

flamen Pomonalis, 104, 263 and n. 23

flamen Portunalis, and Quirinus, 276

flamen Quirinalis, 156–61; Wissowa’s view, 83–84; in *Larentalia*, 269 and n. 35

flamen Voltornalis, 388

flaminica Dialis: *feriata* after thunderbolt, 151–52, 178, 561; (*in*)*arculum*, 152 n. 8; in cults of Regia, 172–73; at *sacella Argeorum*, 449

Flora, -alia: gods of T. Tatius, 169–70; *Floralia*, 184; 270, 385; Italic cults, 43 and n. 10 (Oscan *Floso*–?); 270 n. 37 (Oscan *Fluusa*–)

foculus, 315, 558

focus, 353, 558, 618; see also *Lares*; *Penates*

Fons, Fontinalia, 388

Forculus, 614

Fordicidia, 223, 371–73

Fornacalia, 159–60

Fortuna: *diei*, *loci*, etc., 39, 42; *Primi-genia*, of Praeneste, 55, 393, 423 n. 31; two *Fortunae* of Antium, 423, 429; after Trebia, 460

fox: *Cerialia*, 375–76

freedmen: Feronia, 414–16; influence of, 527–28

functions, three, 161–65, 273–77; and

functions—(cont.)

horse, 278–80; three primitive tribes and, 66–73, 163–65, 188–89; three heads, 466–69

funerary practices, 63–64, 368–69, 377

funesta (*familia*), 284, 364, 617

furor, 210 and n. 9, 229

Furrina, 47, 105, 108

futile, 319

Genius: loci, 39, 44; buckler of Capitol, 39, 44, 362; no flamen, 105; and Juno, 292–93; of divinities, 293, 361; 357–63; meaning, 358; *lectus genialis*, and *dies natalis*, 359–60; and Lar, 361; *G. urbis Romae, populi Romani, Publicus*, 362, 508–11; of master, 611–12

geopolitics, 65

goat: Juno of Falerii, 297; Lupercalia, 348–49

Gracchus, Caius: Concordia, 403–4; and prodigies, 610

graeus ritus, 436, 442–43, 445, 450, 567–75

Hannibal: Capena, 420–21; Second Punic War, 457–89; and Juno Lacinia, 465; at gates of Rome, 480

haruspices: under Vespasian, 238–39; evolution of science of, 307–8; *Ratunna*, 309; and Caesar, 543–44; in private cult, 603, 606–10, 619

Hercules: and Acca Larentina, 57; Victor, 245, 433, 437; in first collective lectisternium, 412; 433–39; and Herakles, 433–34, 438; and Pompey the Great, 438, 542; after Trebia, 460–61; not included in lectisternium of 217, 476–77; and apotheosis, 504; and Sulla, 537; *inuietus*, 542

Herie Junonis, 397

homo diuus: Scipio, 505–7; Caesar, 547–49

Honos and Virtus, 241, 399–400, 542

Hora Quirini, 43 n. 10, 397

horse: and *flamen Dialis*, 153; and *flamen Martialis*, 154 and n. 11; horse's blood at Parilia, 223, 383; Consus, 268; and three functions, 278–80; Aricia, 408 n. 6; see also *Equus October*

hostiae: succidanae, 174 n. 43, 558–59;

maiores, lactentes, 231–32, 559; four usual victims, 468, 554; 557–59

Ianiculum, 329

ianual, 330

Janus: formula of *deuotio*, 93–94; god of *prima*, 100, 181; has no flamen, 105, 333; J. Quirinus, 167, 265–66; Junonius, 295, 330; 327–33; etymology, 327; Patulcius, Clusius, 328–29; *bifrons*, 331; temple, doors of, 332; Etruscan Ani, 332; comparison with Heimdallr, 332–33; and *rex*, 333; Ceres, 375; in private cult, 613

Ides: and Jupiter, 113, 180–81, 334, 562; *ouis Idulis*, 114, 180; of May (Mercury), 340; of June (*Minusculae Quinquatrus*), 622; of July (*transuectio equitum*), 399; of August (Diana), 408, 410; of September and November (Jupiter, *epulum Jouis*), 573; of October (*Equus October*), 215–28; of November (Feronia), 414

in iure cessio, 122, 436

inauguratio, 87, 108, 188, 497

incubatio, 443

indictio belli: and Mars, 208; see also *fetials*

Indigetes and *Nouensiles*: mistake of Wissowa, 14; unexplained, 38 n. 5; formula of *deuotio*, 93–95, 144; at end of *Metamorphoses*, 95 n. 6

indigitamenta: of early childhood, of wedding night, 33–34; of flamen of Ceres, 34–35; of Fratres Arvales, 35; interpretation, 36–38; compared with *Indigetes*, 95

Intercidona, 616

interpretatio (*graeca*, etc): preserves ancient divinities while distorting them, 48; of Matuta, 55, 256; of Vedius, 203 n. 39; internal logic of, 255, 305; of Ceres and its consequences, 374–75; i. gr. of Etruscans, models for those of Romans, 447; Livius Andronicus, Naevius, 454–56; importance of i. gr. in ideology of Second Punic War, 458; i. of Tani as Juno, 464–65

- Inuus*, 347-49
iuge(s) auspiciu(m), 84-88
Julius Proculus, 248, 265
Junius Brutus, 155, 387
Juno: *Iterduca*, *Domiduca*, 34, 37; *Moneta*, 45; *Juga*, 87 n. 5; has no *flamen*, 105; 291-303; name, 292; and *Genius*, 292-94; and eyebrows, 293-94; *Lucina*, 294, 349; and *Calends*, 294-95; *Couella*, 295; *Cur(r)itis*, *Quiritis*, 296, 427 n. 4; *Regina*, 296, 462-64; of *Falerii*, of *Tibur*, 296-97; S.M.R. of *Lanuvium*, 297-98, 430-31, 460, 461; *Latte's thesis*, 299; and *Hera*, 299-300; and bivalent and trivalent goddesses of other Indo-European peoples, 300-303; *Lupercalia*, 349; *Calendae fabariae*, 387; *evocatio* of *Juno* of *Veii*, 426-27; importance in Second Punic War, 458, 463-70; *Caelestis*, of *Carthage*, 464; *J. Lacinia* and *Hannibal*, 465; *exoratio* and *evocatio* of *J.* of *Carthage*, 469-70; *Colonia Junonia*, New *Carthage*, 469-70, 610; and *Jupiter* in *lectisternium* of 217, 476-77; *J. Regina*, cult in 207, 481-82; and *Minerva* at *epulum Jouis*, 568
Jupiter: *Lapis*, 28, 179, 272; and *Numa*, 40-41; O.M., 41, 190, 278; *Stator Victor Elicius*, 45, 187; *Pistor*, 57; *fetials*, 91; formula of *deuotio*, 93; in calendar, 113; earliest *J.*: *flamen Dialis*, 151-54; *Feretrius*, 167, 180, 186, 491, 590; 176-204; and *Zeus*, *Dyauf*, 176-77; *Lucetius*, *Elicius*, 178; and augurs, 179, 188; *Dius Fidius*, 180; and *Ides*, 180-81; *Ruminus*, *Almus*, *Farreus*, 182; and agriculture, 181-84; *daps*, *J. Dapalis*, *Epulo*, 182-83, 231; and wine; *Vinalia*, 183-86; and war, 186-88, 196; *Stator*, 186-87, 483; and *Tinia*, 188; *Liber(tas)*, 190; and advancement of plebs, 191-96; *Victor*, 194, 196, 241; and *Zeus*, 197; and *fatum*, 197; and *Dius Fidius*, 198-201; *Summanus*, 199-200; *Juventas* and *Terminus*, 200-203; of other Italic peoples, 203-4; *Latiaris*, 204, 447, 463; and horse, 278; *Capitolinus*, 287-91; after *Trebia*, 462-63; *uer sacrum* directed to *J.* after *Trasimene*, 475-76; and *Juno* in *lectisternium* of 217, 476-77; *Ennius*, 491; *J.*, father of *Scipio*, 505-6; *Sabazios*, 525; in private cult, 612-13; and flute-players, 622; see also *Capitol*; *Capitoline triad*; *pre-Capitoline triad ius*: and *Vedic yós*, 81 and n. 2; *iustum bellum*, 123; and *fas*, 131-32; *iustus* and *pius*, 132-33; *iusta facere*, 617
Juturna: and *Castor*, 388, 412-13; 622
Juventas, 116, 200-202; after *Trebia*, 460; 498
lamb: sacrificed to *Quirinus*, 149; ewe, sacrificed to *Juno*, 173, 295
lapis manalis, 178; *Lapis Niger*, 84-88, 101, 594; *Jupiter Lapis*, 28, 179, 272
Larentalia: etiological legend, 57-58; feast, *flamen Quirinalis*, 100, 156, 268-69 and n. 33
Larenti(n)a (Acca), 268-69, 341; see also *Larentalia*; *Larunda*
Lares: formula of *deuotio*, 93-94; gods of *T. Tatius*, 169-70; *Praestites*, 245, 343-44; 341-46; *Lar familiaris*, 341-42, 615; *Mater Larum*, 341 n. 20, 367; *Compitales*, 343, 615; *Lar Aineias*, 453, 500 n. 5
laruae, *laruatus*, 367-68
Larunda: gods of *T. Tatius*, 169-70; 268-69
law and religion: prudence, 40-46, 119-20; juridical spirit of Romans, 117; 122-24
lectisternium: in 399, 412, 439, 475; in 217, 305, 476-77; 567-68
Lemures, *Lemuria*, 366-67
lex Cornelia, 541 n. 15, 587; *Julia*, 587; *Ogulnia*, 103, 194, 587; *Papia*, 587; *regia*, 167 and n. 29; *leges sacratae*, 195; *lex templi (Furfo)*, 582 n. 10
Liber, *Libera*, 43 n. 10, 377-78, 516; *Liberalia*, 213, 219 n. 20, 377, 616
Libri fatales, *sibyllini*, 119, 126, 192, 441-42, 444, 448; during Second Punic War, 462, 479, 484; *Sulla*, 541 n. 15, 605; 602-4
Limentinus, 614

- litatio*, 174 n. 43, 232, 558, 650
lituus, 121, 189, 596-97
 Livius Andronicus, 455, 481, 500
 Lua Mater, 209, 272, 397
 Lucaria, 563
 Luceres, 164-65, 188
 Lucilius, 528
 Lucina: gods of T. Tatius, 169-70; see also Juno
 Lucretius, 51 n. 5, 549
 Lucumon, 164, 256, 501, 584
ludi, 571-75; *Apollinares*, 480, 514, 574; *Capitolini*, 572-73; *Ceriales*, 375, 574; *Florales*, 574; *magni, Romani*, 483, 572-73; *Megalenses*, 486, 574; *Piscatorii*, 320 n. 12, 622; *Plebei*, 573; *Saeculares*, 445 and n. 8; *scaenici*, 448, 574-75; *Taur(e)i*, 571; *ludus Troiae*, 571
 Luna: gods of T. Tatius, 169-70; 389 n. 29, 411 n. 11
 Luperca (Valeria), 350 and n. 34; Luper-ci (Quinctiales, Fabiani), 347 (and etymology, n. 30), 621; (Julii), 349, 547, 591-92
 Lupercalia: unexplained rite, 56; ritual, 348; myth, 349; and royalty, 349-50
 lustration: of arms, trumpets, 206; of fields, 230-34; of army, 238-39; Iguvium, 244; Compitalia, 343; *februa*, etc., 347-48; Parilia, 383; water, 388; after Trebia, 460-61; 557, 565; *dies lustricus*, 500 n. 5, 616
lustrum, 497; *l. conditum*, 230
 Lydus, Johannes, 101
Lymphae, nymphs, 388; *lymphatus*, 368; see also Carmentis; Egeria
magmenta, 558
 Magna Mater: *transuectio*, 484, 485-87; cult of, 487-88; Bataces, 535; castration, 603; see also *ludi Megalenses*
 Maia Volcani, 397
maiestas, 19 n. 4, 124, 508
maior-minor, 106-7 and n. 2
 Mamers, 212
 Mamilia (tower), 216, 226 and n. 33
 Mamurius Veturius: *ancilia*, 214-15, 334; Vortumnus, 340; *carmen Saliare*, 591
 Manes: formula of *deuotio*, 93; 363-66; and Genius, 368; and Dis, 445
maniae, 343
Marciana (carmina), 480, 515, 605
 Marius, 534-36 and n. 10
 Marmar: *carmen Aruale*, 212, 229
 marriage, 615-16
 Mars: *hastae*, 22-28, 173, 174 n. 43; formula of *deuotio*, 93; earliest Mars, 154-56; *sacrarium* in Regia, 173, 207; 205-45; outside walls, 206; and war, military aristocracy, 205-13; and *uer sacrum*, 208; *caecus*, 209, 471; name; and Marut, 211-12; agrarian, 213-40, 236 n. 49; solitary, 241; of other Italic peoples, 241-45; *Mares*, 244; and horse, 278; after Trasimene, 470-71; and Venus in lectisternium of 217, 476-77; Ultor, 546; in private cult, 591-92; see also Campus Martius; *Equus October*; lustration of fields; Mamers; Mamurius Veturius; Marmar; *Mauors*; Quirinus; Silvanus; *suouetaurilia*; wolf; woodpecker
 Martha, 534-35
 Matronalia, 294-95; and *serui*, 618
 Matuta (Mater), Matralia, 50-55, 256, 337-39
Mauors, 205, 212
 Meditrinalia, 155 n. 13, 183
 Mefitis, 230 n. 40
 Mens, 470, 474-75
 Mercury, 439-40; in *Amphitruo*, 492-93
milites: articulated with Quirites, 259-63
 Minerva: for Nerio, 241; *cista* of Praeneste, mirrors, 243-44; 303-6; and Quinquatrus, 303, 306 n. 25; Capta, 304, 427; and Athena, 305; and Anna Perenna, 305-6; in lectisternium of 217, 476
mola salsa, *immolare*, 318, 558, 586
 Moles Martis, 207, 241, 397
 mules, 279
mundus, 351-53
muries, 318, 586
mutitationes, 488 and n. 36
 Mutunus Tutunus, 616 n. 7
 mythology, Roman, 47-59, 99-100; and history, 60-78

- Naevius, Cn., 456-57
 Neptunus, 389 and n. 29; N. Equestris (Consus), 268
 Nerio, 207, 241, 392; and Minerva, 272, 305
 Nigidius Figulus, 550 and n. 26
 Nona, *Neuna (fata)*, 500 n. 5
 Nonae: *Juno Couella*, 295; N. Caprotinae, 56-57, 294, 562
novendiale sacrificium: after a shower of stones, 458 and n. 2, 460, 561, 603; after a death, 617
Nouensiles, see *Indigetes* and *Nouensiles*
 Nudipedalia, 178
 Numa: and Jupiter, 40-41, 123; establishment of priesthoods, 144; and major flamens, 152; law governing *spolia opima*, 167; and Romulus, 75, 198-99; and Fides, 199; and Terminus, 202-3; and *ancilia*, 214; and Fordicidia, 372; and Pythagoras; Books of Numa, 372, 410, 521-25; calendar, 559; *inauguratio*, 597; and crafts, 622 and n. 13; see also Romulus
numen, 19-20, 28-31, 217
nundinae, 172-73 and n. 40, 179; *Nundina (fata)*, 500 n. 5
nuntiatio, 598; cf. 121
obnuntiatio, 528 n. 1
 Olenus Calenus, 41-42, 308; see also *caput humanum*
 omen, 120-21, 544-45; etymology, 600 n. 10
 Ops, Opeconsivia, Opalia, 156-58, 267-68; gods of T. Tatius, 169-70; secret name of Rome, 270; *sacrarium* in Regia; Opalia, myth of founding, 277; see also Consus
 Orbona, 335
 Orcus, 369
ordo sacerdotum, 103-12, 143
 origins, history of: date of beginnings, 9-10; and archaeology, 10-11; see also Romulus; synoecism; Tatius
os resectum, 617
oscines, 598
ostenta, see prodigies
 ox: sacrificed to Jupiter, *spolia opima*, 149; *uotum pro bubus*, 234-35; ox or heifer, sacrificed to Hercules, 435; hecatombs, 559
 Palatine: and geopolitics, 64-65, 77; Palatua, 341 n. 19; Pales, 384; Evander, 392; Lupercalia, 347-48, 592; *Salii Palatini*, 147
 Palatua: flamen, 104; 341 n. 19
 Pales: sex of, 43, 380-81; two Pales, 381-83
 Pallor and Pavor, 241
 Panda Cela, 381
papa, 612
 Parcae, 392 n. 35, 500 n. 5
 Parentalia, 366-67; *dies parentales*, *diui parentum*, 617
 Parilia: fires, 57; and *Equus October*, 222-24; *suffimen*, 381-83; etymology, 383; *dies natalis* of Rome, 384
pater, mater, 124, 298, 371
pater patratus, 92, 273-74, 590
 Paulus Diaconus, 97
pax: *p. deorum*, 125, 133; and Quirinus, 258-62; and Janus, 332
 Penates: adjective, 341-42; 353-55; and *focus*, Lares, 353; of Roman people, 354; *P. publici*, and Dioscuri, 355; Lavinium, 355; Etruscan, 381
persona, Etruscan *persu*, 574-75
piatrix, expiatrix, 37, 612
 Pietas, 398
 pig: ritual of fetials, 42; in list of usual victims, 554; *porcus propudialis*, 621; see also sow; *suovetaurilia*
 Pilumnus and Picumnus, 616
 Pinarii, 434-35, 621
pious, 132 and n. 12, 133; *impius*, 555-56
 Plautus, 492-93, 506-7
pomerium, 447, 472 and n. 16, 487, 538, 579
 Pomona, 43 n. 10, 271, 340
 Pomones, 43 n. 10
pompa Circensis, 572; *p. funebris*, 364
 Pompey, 541-42
pontifex: *p., rex*, major flamens, 102-12, 189, 582-85; *ordo sacerdotum*, 143; and Regia, 172; Larentalia, 156, 269 and n. 35; and *aedes Vestae*, 324; L. Cae-

pontifex—(cont.)

cilius Metellus, 324–25; sacrifice to Tellus, 374; affair of temple of Honos and Virtus, 399; and decemvirs, 444; and Argea, 449; admittance of plebeians to college of pontiffs, 451; p., decemvirs, and haruspices, in 207, 481–83 and n. 29; Caesar, 547; meaning of word, 580 n. 6, 583 and n. 12; p. *maximus*, 582, 588; p. *minores*, 587; replacement of Fratres Arvales, 592; in private cults, 620

Poplifugia, 113, 179, 562

portenta, *see* prodigies

Portunus: and Palaemon, 55, 256; and Quirinus, 263; and Janus, etymology, 329; *see also flamen Portunalis*

Postuorta (Carmentis), 393

Potitii, 434–35, 621

praefericulum, 174

praeformatio, 240, 613

pre-Capitoline triad (Jupiter-Mars-Quirinus): formula of *deuotio*, 93; 141–280; Wissowa's interpretation, 141–42; variants of, 170–74 and n. 43; after Tarquins, 189–90; in Augustan poets, 247–48; error of C. Koch, 266 n. 28; type of triad, 280; *see also* functions, three; and under "Italy": *Grabouio*; Iguvium

pre-Servian tribes and functional tripartition, 66–73, 164–65; Attus Navius, 188–89

primitivism, predeism, 18–46

probatio, 373

procuratio, *see* prodigies

prodigies: quadriga of Veii, 308–9; Second Punic War, 459–60, 461, 481; Marius, 535; *procuratio*, 557, 600–10; "happy" prodigy, 609; private p. and their *procuratio*, 619–20; *see also caput humanum*

profanare, *profanus*, 130 and n. 5, 437 and n. 7, 559 and n. 12

propitius, 133

Prorsa, Porrima (Carmentis), 393

Proserpina, 380, 444–45

pullarius, 38, 599; *pullaria auguria*, 121

puluinar: Jupiter, 311; Sol, 432; all *puluinaria*, 460; in 217, 476; Caesar, 547; 567

purus, 81

Pythagoras, Pythagoreanism: Cato, 495–96; Books of Numa, 521–25

Quinquatrus, 206, 622; *minuscuae Q.*, 303 n. 24, 622

Quirinal: and geopolitics, 64–65; and Quirinus, 77–78, 148–49; 432

Quirinalia: and *stultorum feriae*, 158–59

Quirinus: and Hora, 43 and n. 10, 397; and Quirinal, 77–78; formula of *deuotio*, 93; etymology, 108, 150 n. 5; and Mars, 108–9; and Quirites, *curia*, 160–61, 259–63; gods of T. Tatius, 169–70; 246–72; and Romulus, 247–49; "Sabine Mars," 251; and Indian and Scandinavian gods of third function, 251–53; and peace, 257–63; "Mars qui praeest paci," 262; and Enyalios, 263–64; internal contradictions, 265; and Janus, 265–66; and Mars in treaty of alliance with Carthage, 274–75; *see also* Mars; pre-Capitoline triad; Quirites; Virites Quirini

Quirites: and *milites*, 161, 259–61; Quiris, 168 n. 32; *see also* Quirinus

ram: sacrificed to Jupiter on *nundinae*, 172; *see also suouetaurilia*

Ramnēs, 164–65, 188

Ratumena, 309

Rediculus, 46 n. 12

Regia: and *Equus* October, 17, 217–28; *hastae Martis*, 25–28; site, 78; cults and plan, 111, 172–74; *sacrarium Martis*, 207; *sacrarium Opis*, 267–68; fresh laurels on 1 March, 323

Regifugium, 113, 179, 562

regina: antiquity of word, 17; and *flaminica*, 152 n. 8, 576; cults of Regia, 172–73; *see also* Juno

religio, *religiosus*, 40, 130, 132 and n. 10, 427, 556; *dies r.*, 564

(re)nuntiatio, 121, 599

- rex*: antiquity of word, 16-17; and *flamen Dialis*, 17, 103, 109-12, 152; and *iuge(s) auspicium*, 85-87; and *pontifex*, 102, 109-10, 189; and *rājan*, 16-17, 114-15, 577; in *ordo sacerdotum*, 143; *spolia opima*, 168, 186; and Jupiter, 179, 189; *affectatio regni*, 191; and Janus, 333; *Lupercalia*, 333, 349-50; *r. Nemorensis*, 408; and calendar, 447; Caesar, 547; place among priest-hoods, 576-77; *r.*, major *flamens*, and *pontifex*, 582-85
- ritus*, *rite*, 81, 133 n. 14
- Robigus, *Robigalia*, 156, 158, 174 n. 43, 184, 230 n. 40, 259, 265
- Rome: ideological advancement, 509-11; proof of religion, 510
- Romulus: and Numa, 75, 198-99; and Quirinus, 248-50; twin, 252-55; tri-functional character, 255-56; and civil wars, 531-32
- Ruminalis ficus*, 182, 250 n. 3
- Sabines: in Rome's earliest period, legend and reality, 5-7, 60-61, 63-65, 164; "Sabine Quirinus," 251; *Comitium*, 404; rape of Sabine women, 4-5, 67-73, 255; Varro's "Sabinism," 97, 432; Aurelii, of Sabine origin, 621
- sacer*: *leges sacratae*, 85, 129-31, 195; 428; *Sacer Mons*, 195 and n. 27, 213; see also *Sacra Via*; *uer sacrum*
- sacerdotes*, 576-93
- sacra gentilitia*, 410, 621; *s. priuata* and *publica*, 428, 554-55; *s. municipalia*, 429; *s. publica*, 555-75; *s. popularia*, 617-18
- Sacra Via*: *iuge(s) auspicium*, 87; *Equus October*, 215, 226; triumph, 288, 439, 567
- sacrani*, 208
- sacrarium*, *sacellum*, 115 and n. 3
- sacrifices, 557-59; human (or ritual murders), 449-50
- saeculum*, 444, 497; see also *ludi Saeculares*
- saga*, 612
- sagmina*, 589
- Salacia, 389, 397
- Saliae uirgines*, 173
- Salii*: *Palatini* and *Collini*, *Agonenses*, in *tutela Iouis Martis Quirini*, 146-47; explanation of, 166, 236 n. 49, 276-77; *ancile*, one of three guarantees of Rome, 311; enhanced significance of *ancilia*, 499; ritual, *carmen*, 591
- Salus*: *Salus P.R.*, 195 n. 24; = *Hygieia*, 444 and n. 5; *augurium salutis*, 596
- Salvius*, 529 n. 3
- sanctus*, 130-31
- Sancus*, see *Semo Sancus*
- Saturnalia*, 277, 331
- Saturnus* (*Saeturnus*), 170, 271-72; after Trebia, 461; and slaves, 618
- Scaevola, Q. Mucius, 98, 323, 531
- Scipio, P. Cornelius: son of Jupiter, *homo diuus*, 505-7
- scribae pontificum*, 587
- Segetia, Segesta, 157 n. 267, 573
- Seia, 157 n. 15, 267, 573
- sellisternium*, 568
- sementinae feriae*, 376, 392 n. 35
- semideus*: Scipio, 504-7; Caesar, 547-49
- Semo Sancus*, 180
- Semones*, 228-31
- senate: and pontiffs, 111; consul's report de religione to, 119; *procuratio*, 120; and Caudine Forks, 123; *flamen Dialis* in, 152; M. Curtius, 192; first session, in Capitol, 287; three *senacula*, 391, 403; directs religious life of state, 443; religious initiatives during Second Punic War, 459, 472, 474, 478, 483, 489; affair of Bacchanals, 517-20; Books of Numa, 522; and Martha, 534; and Caesar, 547-48; *dies religiosi*, 564; and fetials, 590; and haruspices, 604, 607-10
- Sentinum, battle of: intervention of gods, 8, 89, 194; offerings to gods in preceding year, 249-50
- Septimontium, 11, 561
- serpent: *genius loci*, 44; Juno of Lanuvium, 298; Genius, 361; Aesculapius, 443; birth of Scipio, 506
- sheep: sacrificed to Robigus, 158; and two Pales, 382-83; in list of usual victims, 554; see also Ides; lamb; ram *suouetaurilia*

- silicernium*, 617
silentium, 619
 Silvanus: and newly delivered mothers, 34, 616; joint sacrifice to S. and Mars, 235-36; 344-46
simpulatrix, 612
siue deus siue dea, 39, 43 and n. 10; *siue mas siue femina*, 43-44, 362, 469 and n. 11
 slaves: Lares, 342; Silvanus, 346; Genius, 361; Feronia, 416-18; conscription, increase in numbers of, 512, 527; slave revolts, 529-30; private cult, 618
 social wars and religion, 529-30
sodalitates, 588-93
 Sol: gods of T. Tatius, 169-70; S. Indiges, 389 n. 29, 563; Aurelii, 432, 621; *pulvinar Solis*, 432
sororius, *sororiare*, 50 n. 3, 206 n. 2
 sow: sacrificed to Juno on calends, 173; sacrificed to Tellus and Ceres, 240, 375-77; *praecidaneae*, 376-77; *praesentanea*, 377; pregnant, sacrificed to Tellus and Ceres, 370; in *foedus*, 404; see also *hostiae*; pig
 Spartacus, 517, 530
 specialization (times, places, priests), 114-15, 329-30, 578
 Spes, 398
 Spinensis, 19
spolia opima, 144, 166-68
 square and round, 313, 316
 Stercutius, 20
stips, 437-38, 570
strues, 153
strufertarius, 612
stultorum feriae, see Quirinalia
substratum, 60-64
suffimen (Parilia), 220-24, 384, 586; *suffitio* (funerary ritual), 617
 Sulla, L. Cornelius: reconstruction of Capitol, 286; 536-41; and Apollo, 538-39; Felix, 540; and Venus, 540-41; *lex Cornelia*, 541 n. 15, 587; *quindecimviri*, Sibylline Books reconstructed, 605
 Summanus, gods of T. Tatius, 169-70
suouetaurilia (*solis*-), 149, 167, 231, 237-40
 superstitions: during Second Punic War, 513-14; at end of Republic, 620
supplicatio, 443, 462, 569-70, 603
 synoecism: Mommsen, 5-7; Piganiol, 60-62; criticism, 62-65; comparative analysis of legend, 66-73
tabulis ceraue, ritual of fetials, 92-93
 Tacita, 367, 612
 talismans, trifunctional, fallen from sky, 166
 Tarentum (Terentum), *ludi Tarentini*, 444-45
 Tarpeia, 68, 69 and n. 14
 Tatius, Titus: Mommsen's *Tatius-legende*, 5-7; associate of Romulus, 256, 584; "gods of Titus Tatius," 81, 169-70, 267-72, 371, 375; meaning assigned to expression in this book, 169 n. 34, 267
 Tellumo, 43 n. 10, 374 n. 7
 Tellus: Vervactor, etc., 34-35; formula of *deuotio*, 93-94; no flamen, 105; pit of M. Curtius, 192-93; 370-74; and Ceres, 370; and marriage, 376; *Fordicidia*, 371-74
templum: square, 314-16; of augur, 121, 597-98; "birth of a temple," 555 n. 4; see also Capitol
 Terminus, Terminalia: -alia, 120; gods of T. Tatius, 169-70; 200-203; see also Jupiter
Tiberinus pater, 388
 Tigillum Sororium, 75 n. 21, 621; see also *sororius*
 Titienses, 164-65, 188
 Titii (*sodales*), 592-93
transuectio equitum, 206, 399, 413
 Tricipitinus, 621
tripudium, 599
 triumph: and Jupiter, 288; of Aemilius Paulus, 288-90; of Caesar, 547; divinization and derision of triumphator, 566-67
 Tubilustrium, 206
 Tutilina, 268
 twins, Romulus-Remus and Nasatya, 252-55
 Varro, M. Terentius, 97-101, 550

- uates*, 127-28, 394
Vedius: gods of T. Tatius, 169-70; 203 n. 39
uenia, 93-94, 125; *see also* *Venus*
Venilia, 389
Venus: and *uenerari*, *uenia*, *uenenum*, 92, 125, 421-22 and n. 26; and Mars, 241; 421-22; Calva, 422, 453 n. 16; Libitina, 422 n. 27, 677; Verticordia, 422 n. 27; and Aphrodite, 422, 476, 540-41; Frutis, 453, 674; Erycina, 454, 470-73; importance in Second Punic War, 458; Ennius, 491-92; and Sulla, 540-41; Victrix (Pompey), 542, 546; and Genetrix (Caesar), 545-49; Genetrix, 546
uer sacrum, 208, 414 n. 18, 475 and n. 22
uerbenarius, 589
Verrius Flaccus, 97
Vervactor, etc., 35-38
Vesta: no flamen, 106; one of three guarantors of Rome, 311; etymology, 322; *V. extrema*, 322-23; not represented by image, 323; in private cult, 324 n. 17, 353-54; of Lavinium, 355; *aedes Vestae*: site, 78; and *Equus October*, 221-22; form, rules, Roman and Indian theories of fires, 311-26; *pignora imperii*, 323; and *Penates publici*, 355
Vestal virgins: incompatible with a flamen *Vestae*, 106; and *rex*, 110, 585-86; and *Ops*, 157, 173; if fire goes out . . . , 315; *mola salsa*, *muries*, 318, 586; admitted into *aedes*; punishment for unchastity (*see campus sceleratus*), 450, 479, 587; 585-87; *maxima*, 588
uictimae, *see hostiae*
Victoria, 195 n. 24, 241, 487; *Victor* (*see Hercules*; *Jupiter*)
Vinalia (rustica, priora): and *Jupiter*, 183-85; myth of, 185; *Venus* in, 472
Virites Quirini, 161, 397
Virtus, *see Honos*
vocabulary: of sacred, preserved, 80-82; military, transformation of, 211-12
Volcanus: gods of T. Tatius, 169-70; destruction of enemy's arms, 209; 320-21; 607; Volcanal, Volcanalia, 321, 388
Volturnus, *Volturnalia*, 388
Volupia, 335, 337
Vortumnus: gods of T. Tatius, 169-70; 339-40; 630 n. 10
uotum: etymology of *uoueo*, 81; *pro bubus*, 234-35; Marcellus, *uoti reus*, 399; Second Punic War, 475-76; 555-56; *uota quinquennalia*, 556
vultures: twelve; symbolizing Rome's duration, 502-4; Marius, 535
water: *aedes Vestae*, 319; *Parilia*, 383; 387-89
wine: significance of, 185; vow of *Papirius Cursor*, 197; *see also* *Vinalia*
wolf, she-wolf: *lupus Martius* at *Sentinum*, 194, 249; and *Hirpini*, 208; she-wolf of *Capitol*, 249-50 and n. 3; and twins, 254; and *Luperci*, 347 and n. 30
woodpecker: and *Picentes*, 208; *picus Martius*, 236 n. 49, 243, 417; *Feronius*, 417; 598

ITALY

- Alba*: destruction of, 12, 410, 424; in formula of *fetial*, 90-92; *Penates*, 355
Antium: two *Fortunae*, 423, 429; fate of, in 338, 429
Ardea: temple with three *cellae*, 285 n. 1; *Venus*, 453; prodigy, 462
Aricia: Mars, 242; month named for *Juno*, 296; *Diana*, 407-8
Caere: early commercial traffic with, 12; *Matuta*, 339; prodigies, 460-61; *lectisternium*, 567
Capena: *lucus Feroniae*, 414-21, 462
Capua, despoilment of, 428
Āerfo-, *Āerfio-* (Umbrian), 43 n. 10, 212, 244-45
Cures, 6-7, 66, 148, 160 n. 19, 251
Depidii, *Digidii* (Praeneste), 253
Diumpa- (Oscan), 388

- Etruria: Etruscan period of Rome, 11; Olenus Calenus, 41; masculine Pales, 43; Juno, 291, 299; and Capitoline triad, 307-10; legend of Aeneas, 310 n. 30, 452 n. 13; Dioscuri, 414; Sibylline Books, 441; influence on Roman religion, 447-48; Argei, 449; Mars, Volcanus, Venus outside walls, 473; theory of destiny, 499-500; and Dionysism, 516; triumph, 567; lectisternium, 567 and n. 21; *ludi Taur(e)i*, 571; *persu*, 574-75; books, 601-2; *haruspices*, 606-10
- Falerii: early commercial traffic with, 12; divination tablets, Mars, 24, 242; Juno Curitis, 296-97, 448 n. 4; Minerva, 303-5, 427; Ceres, Loufir, 378; Mercury, 439
- Feronia, *see under* "Rome"
- Fluusa- (Oscan), 270 n. 37; ?*Floso-* (Oscan), 43 n. 10, 270 n. 37
- Grabouio- (Umbrian), 142, 149-50
- Hercules, 433-34
- Herentas (Oscan), 422
- Herulus (Praeneste), 244, 417
- Hirpi Sorani, 417
- Iguvium, 76 n. 23, 94, 142, 149 and n. 2, 150, 292, 308 n. 29, 397, 425; *see also* *Çerfo-*, *Grabouio-*, *Prestota*, *Tursa*
- Juno, 296-99
- Jupiter: Indiges, Latiaris, Lucetius, Maius, Arcanus, Praestes, Anxurus, Liber, 203-4
- Keri (Oscan), 374
- Lacinium: Juno Lacinia, 465
- Lanuvium: lance of Mars, 24, 242; month named for Juno, 296; Juno, 297-98, 429-30, 448 n. 4, 460-61; *sacerdotes Lanuvini*, 430; Thorii, 432
- Lavinium: Penates, 355; Liber, 378; Juturna, 388, 413; Castor, Dioscuri, 413; particular ties with Rome, 414, 446; "Lar" Aeneas, 452-53, 500 n. 5
- legio linteata* of Samnites, 196, 211, 530
- Loufir (Faliscan), 378
- Mars (Etruscan Mariś-, Mares), 241-45; Trebula Mutuesca, 416-17
- Mirikui (Oscan), 439
- Ostia, 8, 12
- persu* (Etruscan), 574-75
- Pomon- or Pomono- (Umbrian), 43 n. 10
- Praeneste: lance of Mars, 24, 242; Fortuna Primigenia, 55, 333, 423 and n. 31; Depidii, 55, 253; Caeculus, 56 n. 14, 253, 325-26; Jupiter Arcanus, 204; *cista* of, 243-44, 305; month named for Juno, 296; in 338, 429; Herulus, 244, 417
- Prestota*, 244, 245, 344
- Pythagoras, Pythagoreanism, 523-25
- sacratī milites* (Samnite), 210-11
- Satricum: Matuta, 339
- Segesta: Trojan legend, 454 and n. 19, 456 n. 22, 471
- Soranus pater*, 417
- Tarentum: Damia, 350; and *ludi Tarentini* or *Terentini*, 444-45 and n. 7; Livius Andronicus, 455; Cato, 495; Dionysism, 515-16
- Terracina: Feronia, 415-16
- Tibur: month named for Juno, 296; Juno Curitis, 296-97; in 338, 429
- Tifata: Diana, 411
- Tiora Matiene: oracle of Mars, 243, 417
- Trebula Mutuesca: Feronia, 416-17; Mars, 417
- Tursa* (Umbrian), 244-45
- Tusculum: Jupiter Maius, 204; Mamiliī, 226 n. 33; Castor, 412, 413; *sacerdotes Tusculani* at Rome, 430; Fontei, 432; particular ties with Rome, 446; Cato, 493
- Veiī: Tolumnius, 167; temple with three *cellae*, 285; quadriga, 308-9; statuettes of Aeneas, 310 n. 30, 452;

- Veii—(cont.)
 war with V. and Trojan War, 463–64, 500
uesticatu, *Vesticio*- (Umbrian), 322
 Virbius, 408
Vofiono- (Umbrian), 142, 149–50 and n. 5
 Volsinii: Veltune, Voltumna, 339
- GREECE AND THE NEAR EAST
- Aisklapios, Asklepios, 443
 Aphrodite, 422, 471–73, 476, 540; A. Antheia, 270
 Aphrodisias, 540
 Apollo, 442, 538–39; *see also* Delphi
 Ares, 209, 241, 243, 476
 Artemis, 411, 439, 476
 Athena, 244, 305–7, 309–10, 476, 541 n. 15
 Carneades, 525, 528
 Charites: Orchomenos, 166
 Cybele, 485–92
daimōn: and Lares, 342; and Genius, 361; and Manes, 365
 Delphi: apocryphal consultations, 426, 442; after Cannae, 480; Sulla, 538–39
 Demeter, 374–75, 379
 Dionysos, 515–21; Dionysia, 515
 Dioscuri: *dokana*, Sparta, 27; and Aśvin, 171; model for Mars in 282, 210; inequality of, 254; and *Penates publici* of Rome, 355
 Eileithyia, 339
 Enyalios, 263–64, 275
 Enyo, 390, 541 n. 15
 Epicurus, 533
 Euhemerus, 491–92
 Hebe, 201, 461
 Hephaistos, 321
 Hera: “fecund, warlike, and political,” 299; 303, 476
 Herakles, 433–34, 477
 Hermes, 440
heroes, 342
 Hestia, 322
 Hippolytus, 408
 Homonoia, 401, 404 n. 7
 Hygieia, 444 and n. 5
 Karneia, 389
 Kronos, 271
 Leukothea, 55
 Mā, 489, 537, 541 n. 15
 Muses, 438, 455
 Palaimon, 55
 Pan, 345
 Persephone, 445
 Pluto, 445
 Poseidon, 268 n. 30, 389, 440, 476
prosōpon, 575
 Rhea, 271
trittyes, *trittoi*, 237, 554
 Tykhe, 423
 Velkhanos (Cretan), 320 n. 12
 Zeus, 176, 197, 476
 “Zeus Hera Athena”: in Phōkikon, 306–7; in legends of Herakles and of Troy, 309–10
- INDIA
- adhvarā* “sacrifice” (*ādhan-* “road”), *adhvaryū* “active priest,” 579–80 and n. 6
 Agni: birth of Kārttikeya, 56; three fires, 312–14, 318–19; and fishes, 321; place in enumeration of divinities, 322
 animals, five sacrificial, 468
Apām Napāt, 389 n. 29
 Arjuna, 52 n. 7
 Aryaman and Bhaga, 201–2
aṣṭāpadi (“sacrifice of a cow in calf”), 372–73
asvamedha “sacrifice of the horse,” 224–27, 279
 Aśvin: etymology, 279–80; *see also* Nāsatya

Atri, 337

Bhaga, *see* Aryaman

brāhman (neut.) "principle of the first function," *brahmān* (masc.) "presiding priest, doctor of the sacrifice," 17, 80–81, 136 n. 1, 211, 577; and *adhvaryū*, 579–80; and *brāhmana*, 580 n. 7

dhāman and *ṛtā*, 132 n. 9 (cf. *fas* and *ius*)
Dyaauh, 176, 409

Gandharva, 349 n. 33

hōtar "reciting priest," 579–80

ideological fields of India and of Rome, 116–17

Indra: and Trita, 75, 199; and soma, 185; etymology, 207; and thunderbolt, 209; and Marut, 211; invited to leave sacrifices of other *arya*, 425
iṣīrd, *iṣmīn* "inspired by warlike fervor," 211–12

Karna, solar hero, 52 n. 7

Kārttikeya: engendered by Agni-hearth fire, 56 and n. 14

kṣatrd, principle of the second function, 211, 279

marriage, 615

Marut, 211, 212, 372–73

mārya "headstrong young warrior," 211, 212

Mitra, *see* Varuṇa

"Mitra-Varuṇa, Indra, Nāsatya," 161, 171, 177, 239, 252

Nāsatya (Aśvin), 164, 171, 252–53, 279–80

paryāṅga, *paryāṅgya* "secondary victims connected with the horse of the *aśav-medha*," 226

pathikṛt "pathmakers," 583 and n. 12
Pitarah, 365

Pitū, 387

precautionary Vedic formulas, 42–43

Puraṃdhi, 268

puróhita "chaplain of the king," 17, 577

Pūṣan, 171, 384 n. 24

rāj(an) "king," 16–17, 80, 163, 225–26, 577; *rājñī* "queen," 17

Rātri "Night," 52–54

Rbhu "workmen of the gods, worker-gods," 166 n. 28, 591

ṛtā "cosmic order, ritual, moral," 52, 81, 132 n. 9

Rudra, 344 n. 25, 418–20 and n. 22

śams- "to pronounce a qualifying word," 81 and n. 4

Sarasvatī: in *sautrāmani*, 239; trivalent, 300–2

sautrāmani "sacrifice of a goat, a ram, and a bull to Indra the good protector," 238–40

Savitar, 375

śraddhā "religious belief," 81 and n. 3

Trita, 75, 199

udgātār "choirmaster priest," 579–80

Uśás, Uśasaḥ "Dawn, the Dawns," 51–55

Vāc, 392

varṇa, the four, 163

Varuṇa and Mitra, 75, 201–2; and horse, 279

Viśpalā, 384

Viśvedevāḥ, 171

yóṣ "integrity, mystical perfection," 81 and n. 2

yudh- "to battle," 211

IRAN

Aməsa Spənta, 322

Anāhitā, 240 n. 54; trivalent, 302

Ātar, 322

Drvāspā, 240 n. 54

Indra, one of archdemons, 177

mairya, 211, 212

Miθra, 177

xšaθra "power," 211

THE GERMANIC PEOPLES

Æsir and Vanir, war between, 71-73,
164

Berserkers, 210

Black Elves, 166 n. 28

Fenrir, 336

Freyja, Frigg, 71, 73, 302

Freyr, 71-73, 252, 257-58

Fulla, 268

Gullveig, 72 and n. 15

Hallgrímr, halberd of, 23

Heimdallr, 333, 409

Magni, 208

Móði, 208

Nerthus, 252, 257

Óðinn, 71-73; and Týr, 75-76; and wine,
mead, 186; and Heimdallr, 333;
Othinus and Thor (Saxo Gram-
maticus), 256-57

"Óðinn, þórr, Freyr (Njörðr)," 161, 177

Rígsþula, 261

Týr, 75-76

þórr, 71-73, 208, 209

Víðarr, 335 n. 13, 337

THE CELTIC PEOPLES

dth (Irish) "ford," 328-29

druid, 16-17, 82, 163, 577

Fianna (Irish), 210

Math (Welsh), 586

Nechtan (Irish), 389 n. 29

rhyd (Welsh) "ford," 329

rigain (Irish) "queen," 17

rix (Welsh), *rí* (Irish) "king," 16-17, 80-
81, 577

Tuatha dé Danann, talismans of, 166 n.
28

THE HITTITES

euocatio, functional colors in, 425

hā- "to accept as the truth," 600 n. 10

hašša "hearth," 314 n. 6

treatise, Mitanian-Hittite, 171

wan- "to seduce," 421 n. 6

THE OSSETES

general prayer, spirit of fire addressed
in, 323

Nart families, three, 74-75

THE KĀFIRS

Gīsh, Imrā, 58-59

THE CIRCASSIAN PEOPLES

deutio, 556 n. 5

VARIA

Africa: sacrifice of pregnant animal
among Zaghawa Kobe of Wadai, 372
and n. 4

Melanesia: *mana*, 18-31, 23 n. 7, 217-18

INDEX TO THE APPENDIX

Alpanu, 683

Alsir, Altria, 683 n. 135

- Amatutun, 678
 Ani, 659, 673, 687, 689
Animales, dii, 668
 **Apru* (whence April), 674 n. 113
Ap(u)lu(n), 674-75
Areatha, Ariadne, 674
 Artumes, Artemis, 675
 Astarte (Carthaginian) and Uni, 680-82
Attalus philosophus, 635, 642, 644
Axvizr, 683

 Begoe, see *Vegoie*
bidental, 645
 brontoscopic calendar, 637-42

 Caecina, A., 635-37
 Caere, 627, 677 n. 120, 680-84; see also *Pyrgi*
 Catmite, Ganymede, 675
 Charun, *ḫarun*, 693-95
 Cilen, see *Superiores* (dii)
Consentes, *Complices* (dii), 644, 646, 647 n. 49, 648, 685-86, 688; see also *thuf*
 Cornelius Labeo, 635 n. 18
 cosmology, 669 n. 95
 Culśu, 694

 dead, world of the, 691-95

 Eita, 692, 694
 Etruscan language, 626-32

Fauores opertanei, 686, 688
 Fons, 686, 690
 Fonteius Capito, C., 635 and n. 19
 Fufluns, 674
fulgur(i)ator, 649 and nn. 51 and 53, 659, 660 n. 78
fulmina, see *manubiae*

 Genius, 636
 gods, 673-84; groupings of, 684-91; supreme, 684 n. 138; *azoni*, 686-87; *residui*, 686-87; see also *Animales*; *Consentes*; *Superiores*
 grid and wheel, on liver of Piacenza, 651-53, 690-91
haru-, 649, 660 n. 78; *haruspices*, 668 n. 93, 669 n. 94, 670-72
 hepatomancy, Etruscan, 650-59; and Chaldean, 654-58; and Hittite, 654-56; and Greek, 657-58
 Hercle, Hercules, 659, 678-80

 interpretations of Greek gods, Etruscan, 673-76

 Janus (Ani), 659, 686-87
 Juno (Uni): thunderbolts, 643 and n. 33; 659, 673, 674; Astarte, 680-82; of Veii, 684 and n. 137, 686, 687-89
 Jupiter (Tinia): thunderbolts, 643-46; and sixteen regions, 643 n. 36; on liver of Piacenza, 652-54; and *prorogatio*, 667; 673, 674, 686-91; J. Secundanus, 686, 690; Jouis Opulentia, 686, 689; cf. 185 n. 12

 Laran, 673
 Lares, 686, 688; *Lars militaris*, 686, 688-89
 Lasa, 683
 Leinθ, 677, 684
 Lemnos, inscription of, 629-30
libri, 633-37; division of, 637; *L. acherontici*, 637, 668; *L. fulgurales*, 637-49; *L. haruspici*, 649-60; *L. rituales*, 660-72; *L. fatales*, 666
 liver of Piacenza, 650-59, 673, 687-91; l. of Falerii Veteres, 657-58; see also hepatomancy
 Lycian and Etruscan, 630 n. 10
 Lydian and Etruscan, 629-30
 Lydus and theory of thunders, 637, 640-41
 Lymphae, 686, 690

 Manto, 679
manubiae, 643-49
 Mars: thunderbolts, 643 n. 35; *Mares*, *Mariś-*, 673, 677-79; 686, 688-89
 Martianus Capella, 643, 654, 685-91
 Mean, 684
Meteorologica, Greek, 637, 646, 648
 Minerva: thunderbolts, 643 and n. 33; 673, 674, 686, 688, 690
 Mlax, 680

mundus, 662-63

Neptune, 655, 686, 690; *Neðuns*, 659, 673, 674

Nigidius Figulus, 635, 638, 660

Nocturnus, 686, 688 and n. 144

Nouensides, 686, 689-90

octatropos, 647 n. 48

Opulentia Iouis, 686, 689

Orphism, 669 and n. 94

ostentaria, 669-71

Penates, 647, 686, 688, 691 and n. 146

persipnai, Persephone, 692, 694

Pliny and thunderbolts, 642-49

Pluto, 686, 690, 694 n. 165

Praeneste, *cista* of, 677-78

prorogatio, 645, 667, 668

puteal, 645

Pyrghi, inscriptions of, 627, 680-84

Quirinus, 686, 688-89

regiones caeli, 642, 643 n. 33, 645, 646-47; on border of liver of Piacenza, 651-52; 686-87

saeculum, 667-68

Saturnus, *Satres*: thunderbolts, 643 and n. 35; 673, 688 n. 144, 690-91

Selva(ns), 659, 673, 690-91

Semla, *Semele*, 674

Seneca and thunderbolts, 642-49

Seðlans, 673

Sminð, 677 n. 121

Superiores and *Inuoluti (dii)*, 644, 647 and n. 49, 649; = *Cilen?*, 654, 666, 687, 688, 690-91

Tages, *libri Tagetici*, 636-37, 660 n. 79; 669 n. 94; cf. 24

Tarquitius Priscus, 634-35, 670

Tecvm, 673

temples with three *cellae*, 684-85 and nn. 139, 140

þuf-, *þvf-*: = *Consentes?*, 691

Tinia, see *Jupiter*

tivr, 651

tombs, 691-95

Tuxulxa, 694

Turan, 673-74, 677

Turms, 674

Tyrrhenus, 629

Uni, see *Juno*

usils, 651

Vanð, 694

Vegoie (Begoie), *Libri Vegonei*, 636-37

Vel(xans?), 659, 673

Vetisl, 654, 673, 687

Vilae (Iolaos), 676, 680

Vitruvius, on location of public buildings, 663-64

uolumen (book or scroll) of the dead, 694-95

Vulcanus Iouialis, 686, 688 n. 144

Vulcatius, 668 n. 93

PRINCIPAL TEXTS DISCUSSED

Arn. Gent. 2.67 (*lectus genialis*), 359-60; 3.40 (masculine *Pales*), 381; 6.11 (*Mars-lance*), 25-28

Cato Agr. 83 (*pro bubus*), 234-35; 141 (*lustratio agri*), 231-34

Dio Cass. 43.24.4 (*Equus October*), 154 and n. 12 (against H. J. Rose, 218 n.d.)

Fest. (L²) pp. 295-96 (*Equus October*), 216-28; pp. 299-300 (*ordo sacerdotum*), 143; p. 302 (*spolia opima*), 167

Gell. 4.6 (*Jupiter-Mars-Robigus*), 174 n. 43

Lapis Niger, 84-88

Liv. 1.10.1-2 (establishment of major *flamens*), 152; 1.21.4 (major *flamens* and *Fides*), 144-46; 1.24.7 (formula of *fetials*), 92-93; 1.32.6. (formula of *fetials*), 91; 8.9.6 (formula of *deuotio*),

- Liv.--(cont.)
 93-96; 22.1.17-19 (after Trebia), 462-64; 22.9.7-11 (after Trasimene), 470-75; 22.10.8 (lectisternium of 217), 476-77; 27.37.7-15 (ceremonies of 207), 481-83
- Macr. 3.9.7 (*si deus si dea* . . . in the *evocatio* of the Juno of Carthage), 43 n. 9, 469 n. 11
- Mart. Cap. 1.41-61 (first three regions of the sky), 685-91
- Ov. *F.* 4.731-34 (*sanguis equi* in Parilia), 221-23
- Paul. (L²) p. 214 (*lectus genialis*), 359-60; p. 326 (*Equus October*), 219-20
- Plin. *N.H.* 2.146 (Feronia), 415-16
- Plut. *Rom.* 11.1-5 (*mundus*, furrow), 668-69; 29.2 (Mars-lance), 25-28; *Syll.* 12.4-7 (Sulla and Pythian Apollo), 538-39
- Pol. 3.25.6 (Jupiter-Mars-Quirinus), 273-75; 12.4b (*Equus October*), 218-19
- Prop. 4.1.9-32 (three tribes), 164-65 and n. 24; 4.1.19-20 (*curtus equus* in Parilia), 221-23
- Serv. *Georg.* 1.21 (Vervactor, etc.), 34-38; 3.1 (masculine Pales), 381; *Aen.* 1.42 (Jupiter-Juno-Minerva in Etruria), 643 n. 33; 1.292 (Mars and Quirinus), 261-62 and n. 21; 7.800 (Feronia), 415; 8.3 (Mars-lance), 25-28; 8.663 (*Salii in tutela Jouis Martis Quirini*), 142, 146-47
- Varr. *L.L.* 5.74 ("the gods of Titus Tatius"), 169-70 (see 169 n. 34 and 267 for meaning assigned to the expression in this book); 6.88 (convocation of *comitia centuriata*, J. Bayet), 259-60; *R.R.* 2.5.1 (two Pales), 381-82
- Vitr. 1.7 (location of temples), 663-64